Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-008
Wednesday
13 January 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-008 *13 January 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Nazarkin Briefs Media on Geneva CW Talks 1
Addresses CW Meeting 1
Commentary on U.S. CW-Weapons Production *[Gratsianov]* 1
Obukhov Arrives in Geneva, Issues Statement 1
Lebedev Outlines Scope for Arctic Agreements 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Dobrynin, Envoys Discuss European Security 3
Gusev Receives CEMA Delegation Leaders *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jan]* 3
CSSR Ministers Arrive *[Prague CTK]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds Press Conference 12 Jan 4
Optimistic About CW Treaty 4
On Shevardnadze Visit to FRG 4
Gerasimov Interviewed on Human Rights Violations *[Jerusalem]* 4
Rogachev on Gorbachev LIAOWANG Interview 5
Socialist Reaction Noted *[PRAVDA 12 Jan]* 5
News Conference Held on Soviet NOC Decision *[SOVETSKIY SPORT 12 Jan]* 5
GDR's Honecker Pays State Visit to France 7
Meets With Mitterand *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 7
Visit Summed Up *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jan]* 7
Cold War 'Echoes' Seen in French View of GDR *[Bolshakov in PRAVDA 12 Jan]* 8
'Newsreel' Program on Arms Treaty, Other Issues *[Reshetnikov]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Burns Deemed 'Relatively Moderate' ACDA Nominee *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 11
Falin on Using 'Last Opportunities' *[Sofia ZEMEDELSKI ZNAME 7 Jan]* 11
Bogachev on 'Burden' of 'Selective Deterrence' 12
Dobrynin Meets Political Leaders Group 12
Scientists Sign Research Cooperation Accord 13

China

Moscow on Gorbachev's Interview With LIAOWANG 13
Rogachev: No Barriers to Relations With PRC 14
PRC Decision To Create Zhou Enlai Museum *[PRAVDA 11 Jan]* 15
Bilateral Cooperation in Civil Aviation 15

Northeast Asia

'Constructive Dialogue' Between Koreas Urged 15
Demichev Meets Japanese Art Official 16

Near East & South Asia

West's Gulf Aims Hit, UN Role Supported *[Demchenko in PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 16
Destroyer 'Stoykiy' Continues Gulf Escort Duty *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jan]* 17
Israeli Government Extends Visas of Delegation *[TANJUG]* 17
More on Trade With Afghanistan, Aid Documents *[PRAVDA 12 Jan]* 18
French Journalist Abouchard Views Guillo Case *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 13 Jan]* 18
Afghan Front Leader Notes Cease-Fire Anniversary 19
More Armed Afghans Accept Government Policy 19
Afghanistan's Khowst Road 'Open and Functional' 19
12th Aid Convoy Arrives 20
Caravans Arrive 'Daily' 20
Program Views Veterans of Afghan Campaign 21
Astrakhan's Ties With Afghan Province Viewed 22
Briefs 22
Gift Sent to Afghanistan 22

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Angolan, Cuban Event Linkage Called 'Notorious' *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 22

East Europe

Further on Jakes Visit; Tours Frunze District *[Prague CTK]* 23
Comments on Talks 23
Sends Gratitude Telegram 25
Honecker Appeal Will Find 'Positive Response' *[PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 25
Vorontsov Heads Delegation on GDR Visit *[PRAVDA 11 Jan]* 26
Presidium Awards Order of Lenin to Husak 26
Leaders Recognize CSSR's Husak's Birthday *[PRAVDA 10 Jan]* 26
Marchuk on Polish Science Cooperation *[Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 6 Jan]* 26
Romania Thanks Presidium, Council for Greetings *[PRAVDA 9 Jan]* 27
Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society Board Meets *[PRAVDA 12 Jan]* 27

West Europe

Ryzhkov Continues Visit to Sweden 27
Lays Wreath at Palme Tomb 27
Addresses Swedish Businessmen 28
Reveals Personal Outlook *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 27 Dec]* 29
Signs Agreements 30
Service Record of Britain's Thatcher Marked *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 30
Thatcher Visit to Kenya, Nigeria Viewed *[V. Ovchinnikov in PRAVDA 8 Jan]* 31
More on Visit to Nigeria 32
Handling of UK, USSR Nuclear Incidents Contrasted *[Maslennikov in PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 32
Vorontsov Meets FRG, Greek Envoys Envoys 33
FRG Warships To Relieve Gulf-Bound U.S. Ships *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jan]* 33
French Communist Central Committee Plenum Opens 34
Negotiations on U.S. Bases in Greece Begin 34
Italian Communist Natta Greeted on Birthday *[PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 34
Civil Aviation Minister Meets Alitalia President 34
Italy's Spadolini Comments on Soviet-U.S. Summit 34
Portuguese Communist Hails INF Treaty, Reform *[PRAVDA 7 Jan]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Gorbachev Address to Media Chiefs' Meeting 36
Razumovskiy Addresses Uzbekistan Plenum 54

Economic

Slyunkov, Others Address Training Session 54
Price System 'Barrier to Development' *[Komin]* 54

Scientific

Summit's 'Fresh Impulse' Brings Cooperation 54
Moscow Outlines Tasks of Cosmos-1906 Satellite 55
Returned Cosmonauts Interviewed on Readjustment 55
Cardiologist on Cosmonauts 56
Space Medicine 'Success' 56
TV Broadcasts Titov, Manarov 'Mir' Activities 56
Cosmonauts 'Completely Adapted' 57
'Mir' To Receive Nodules 57
TASS Notes Antarctic Research Station's Focus 57
Personnel Changeover at Station 57
'Powerful' TV Station Constructed in Izhevsk *[PRAVDA 30 Dec]* 58

Nazarkin Briefs Media on Geneva CW Talks

LD071608 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 7 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 7 (TASS)—"Starting the production of binary weapons, a new type of chemical arms, the United States has made an unprovoked step to a new round in the race of chemical weapons," said today Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva disarmament negotiations. Speaking here at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists, he noted that this fact cannot but tell on the talks on drafting a convention to ban chemical weapons which will resume in Geneva on January 12. "The USA's position and its unreadiness to advance towards conclusion of a convention are the main difficulty at these talks," pointed out the head of the Soviet delegation.

"The USA stands on the position of 1984," he said, "When it tabled its draft convention. The talks have advanced far ahead, new particulars are being drafted, but the U.S. delegation cannot say anything, since it has no instructions."

"Under these conditions I'm instructed, as the head of a delegation departing for Geneva," Yuriy Nazarkin pointed out, "to do our utmost, in future too, to prevent the breakup of the Geneva talks, to which the USA prods with its actions."

Addresses CW Meeting

LD121909 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Geneva January 12 TASS—TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

Today the multilateral talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons resumed here within the disarmament conference. Delegates will continue agreeing provisions [as received] of an international convention on the general and complete prohibition of this type of mass destruction weapons, destruction of their stockpiles and industrial facilities for their production.

Speaking at today's meeting, Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation, said that the talks resumed under conditions when, on the one hand, a considerable progress had been achieved at them, and, on the other, the USA started production of binary arms, a new generation of chemical weapons. He denounced this militarist action by Washington as an attempt to thwart the process of chemical disarmament, as a manifestation of disrespect for efforts of states participating in the multilateral talks on the prohibition of this type of mass destruction weapons and as a step to a new round of the race in chemical weapons. "The Soviet Union," the Soviet representative said, "will do its utmost in future to prevent a breakup of the Geneva talks, to which the United States prods with its actions."

Commentary on U.S. CW-Weapons Production

DW130937 Moscow International Service in German 1000 GMT 30 Dec 87

[Nikolay Gratsianov commentary]

[Text] Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to say we are speaking of a new generation of CW-weapons. The binary ammunition consists of two or more components that are comparatively harmless. Yet, during the flight of the artillery projectile or the missile warhead those components combine with each other and become a fatal substance that paralyzes the nerves. That is the technical side of the matter.

The most important thing about it is, however, that those weapons are not only produced and stored in U.S. arsenals: They have a special address—Western Europe. It is there where they are supposed to be available for so-called crisis situations. In fact, there is the opportunity to transport the binary ammunition over the ocean under any convenient pretext, which is quite an easy formula to many people, especially because the European partners of the U.S. in May last year—through the NATO countries' defense ministers—gave their blessings to the production of such weapons. The decision was not unanimous. Several countries refrained from it. However, the votes of those willing sufficed to give the green light to a new kind of barbaric weapon. That fact shows that the Pentagon and the NATO leadership have no intention of doing without plans for a potential chemical war in Europe. When that happens, primarily civilians will fall victim.

It must be emphasized that the accumulation of binary ammunition started only a few days after the conclusion of the INF Treaty between the U.S. and the USSR. It seemed that the treaty should at least be a stimulus not to pile up any kinds of other weapons so as to facilitte accords in other fields—possibly in the field of banning and destryoing CW-weapons.

Currently, in Geneva the last phase of negotiations over an international agreement on banning such weapons is continuing. Such an agreement can be signed in the months to come. However, implementing the binary program can by no means contribute to facilitating that convention. What is more, doubts are arising about the sincerity of the U.S. declaration that it is interested in a total ban and destruction of chemical weapons.

Obukhov Arrives in Geneva, Issues Statement

LD121455 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Geneva January 12 TASS—The USSR delegation has arrived here today to participate in the new round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. In his airport statement, Aleksey Obukhov, who heads the USSR delegation, pointed out:

The participants in the talks are facing a responsible task. It was set by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States as a result of their meeting in Washington. This task

is to prepare a draft treaty on 50 per cent reductions in strategic offensive arms of the sides in the conditions of non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty for an agreed period of time.

I would like to emphasize that reaching agreement on the preservation of the ABM Treaty, concluded in 1972, is of particular importance. Compliance with the obligations under the treaty is essential for maintaining strategic stability and is, therefore, a necessary prerequisite for implementing 50 per cent reductions in Soviet and U.S. strategic offensive arms.

The two delegations do not have much time at their disposal as both sides agreed to aim for preparing a new treaty to be signed during the next Soviet-American summit scheduled for the first half of this year.

We have much complicated work to do. We are convinced, however, that there is every opportunity to complete this work within the above-mentioned timeframe. The two delegations have joint instructions formulated as a result of the discussions in Washington on a wide range of key issues relating to a future treaty. We have on the negotiating table a first joint draft text of such treaty, although with many brackets so far which reflects the positions of the two sides as of last autumn. The delegations can rely on the vast positive experience of negotiating the IRM-SRM treaty [INF Treaty] which was signed in December 1987. Mikhail Gorbachev has stressed that the conclusion of this agreement had initiated the process of real disarmament and opened up prospects for deep cuts in the main, namely strategic, arsenals of nuclear weapons.

Indeed, there exists every prerequisite for successful work.

The Soviet side is in favor of making full use of these opportunities and taking new even more important step towards a nuclear-free world. A practical way to build such a world was described in the programme announced by Mikhail Gorbachev on January 15, 1986.

We hope that the American side will take a constructive approach and that through joint effort the two sides will thus successfully and promptly achieve their objective.

Lebedev Outlines Scope for Arctic Agreements

LD131145 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0958 GMT 13 Jan 88

[Excerpts] Moscow 13 Jan (TASS)—The militarization of the Arctic has reached menacing proportions. That is the view of the situation in that part of the world as expressed by Major General Yuriy Lebedev, a spokesman for the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. An interview with him is published in today's issue of the newspaper 'MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI'. [Passage omitted]

In reply to a question on NATO's reaction to the Soviet proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech in Murmansk, the General Staff spokesman said: The NATO leadership's reaction is negative and as yet holds out little promise. Even on the question of a nonnuclear zone in northern Europe, where the Soviet Union could go quite far, and in particular withdraw its submarines equipped with ballistic missiles from the composition of the Soviet Baltic Fleet, the NATO countries are demonstrating their negative attitude. The United States is showing particular stubbornness. Immediately following the signing of the treaty on intermediate and shorter-range missiles, Washington took vigorous steps to persuade the governments of the countries of northern Europe to reject the intention of turning this region into a nonnuclear zone. The main argument used by the United States was that in present-day conditions a powerful nuclear potential is essential. The West should, supposedly, pursue a policy based on strength and nuclear deterrence.

Yuriy Lebedev said that steps could be taken in order to ease tension in the northern region—steps such as the joint discussion with the countries of northern Europe of possible regional confidence-building measures at a lower level than is envisaged by the relevant decisions of the Stockholm conference, including elements of "nonaggressive defense", a sharp limitation of the scale of military exercises and of other activity in the agreed regions.

Second, the conclusion on a bilateral and multilateral basis of agreements to avert incidents at sea and in the air space above the sea which would extend to all the seas that wash northern Europe.

Third, the definition of waters of Warsaw Pact and NATO navies' actions, with account taken of regions of multilateral shipping and fishing.

Fourth, examination of the question of creating in the northern and western Atlantic, for the USSR and the United States respectively, agreed regions in which activities of the antisubmarine forces of both alliances should be banned. The specific whereabouts and sizes of these regions and the steps connected with their establishment could be discussed at the level of Warsaw Pact and NATO military experts.

Fifth, the agreement on indices of major naval and air force exercises (number of participating warships, aircraft, amphibious forces, troops etc.) and the proposing of steps to limit the number of exercises held in the zones of the Baltic, North, Norwegian, and Greenland seas to one or two in 1 or 2 years.

Sixth, prior notification of naval maneuvers and the invitation of observers to them.

It is essential not to allow "compensation" for reduced nuclear arsenals with other forms of weapons, noted Yuriy Lebedev in conclusion. The treaty on the scrapping of two classes of nuclear missiles is not just an episode in international politics. It is the start of the road to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Dobrynin, Envoys Discuss European Security
LD091405 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 9 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 9 TASS—Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today received the ambassadors or charge d'affaires ad interim of Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia.

During the friendly meeting opinions were exchanged on some issues of European security.

Gusev Receives CEMA Delegation Leaders
PM111118 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jan 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Results Discussed"]

[Text] On 6 January V.K. Gusev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, received the leaders of the CEMA countries' delegations to the fourth session of the CEMA standing commission on cooperation in new materials and technologies for their manufacture and processing.

The meeting discussed the results of cooperation among the CEMA countries within the framework of the fourth priority avenue of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific and Technical Progress of the CEMA Countries for creating new construction materials and technologies, outlined measures for the large-scale assimilation and introduction of the results of joint research, and also discussed questions of improving the organization of work in this avenue in light of the decisions of the 43d (extraordinary) CEMA session.

L. Shupka, CEMA deputy secretary, participated in the meeting.

CSSR Ministers Arrive
LD121905 Prague CTK in English 1803 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow Jan 12 (CTK correspondent)—A Czechoslovak delegation led by Minister of Fuel and Power Vlastimil Ehrenberger arrived here today to attend the constituent session of the CMEA Standing Commission for Cooperation in Electrical Energy and Power Engineering.

Vlastimil Ehrenberger will also hold talks in Moscow on Czechoslovak-Soviet cooperation in fuel and power.

Gerasimov Holds Press Conference 12 Jan

Optimistic About CW Treaty

LD121721 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—"The main task of the present round of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva is to prepare a draft document on a 50-per-cent cut in strategic offensive weapons with the observance of the ABM Treaty and its non-violation over an agreed period," said today Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate. He spoke here at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman also said that today the talks to agree the text of an international convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons resumed within the disarmament conference. "The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that the convention can be concluded at the earliest provided there is political will."

The Soviet Union states with satisfaction that such an approach is also shared by other delegations. For instance, on Monday Swedish representative Rolf Ekeus, head of the special committee on chemical weapons in Geneva, said that all the main military and political obstacles in the way of the convention had been lifted and only some intricate technical issues were left to be resolved, which would be quite possible to do this year. "We also paid attention to Mr. Ekeus's words that the convention's ban should also embrace binary weapons."

On Monday Francois Eisburg, director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, also called for urgent ban of chemical weapons. "The talks on banning chemical weapons resume in such, favourable enough, situation," noted the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman.

On Shevardnadze Visit to FRG

LD121727 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—"The Soviet side attaches great importance to the forthcoming visit of the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to West Germany, because it understands the importance of the bilateral relations with this country, its role in Europe and in the whole world", Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists.

"The Soviet side hopes," Gerasimov went on to say. "That the visit will help map out ways of stepping up the bilateral dialogue between the Soviet Union and West Germany".

He pointed out that the conditions "are very favourable because the Soviet-American treaty on intermediate- and shorter range missiles has been concluded" and said that "the Soviet Union is appreciating the role played by West Germany in creating conditions for the treaty being signed."

Gerasimov called West Germany an "important partner" and said that Soviet-West German relations had been "marked by gradual development" since the Moscow treaty was signed in 1970.

"However, the advantages of Soviet-West German relations were not always used fully. At some periods our dialogue was at its low, but not through the Soviet Union's fault. At the time when there were such breakdowns, we tried to weigh the situation and demonstrate restraint and ability to put the essence of our relations higher than an emotional approach, because the Soviet Union thinks it important to develop further the dialogue between our two countries", Gerasimov said.

Gerasimov Interviewed on Human Rights Violations

TA121139 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1105 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Report on telephone interview with Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov by Gid'on Remez on 12 January—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Remez] Gerasimov had nothing new to tell us regarding the reexamination of refuseniks' requests for exit permits. You will recall that many individuals have left the Soviet Union recently, he said, so that the problem is gradually being eliminated.

On the other hand, in response to another question he emphasized: The Soviet public, like its government, is concerned with the violation of the human rights of the Palestinians in the territories:

[Gerasimov—in English] We do not like here in Moscow, and the Soviet public actually does not like it, the situation on Palestinians' human rights. Today, for instance, the news is that three more Palestinians were killed in riots in Israel-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip. Frankly the Soviet public does not like it, and we think that human rights are violated much more seriously than anywhere else. [passage omitted]

[Remez] As everyone knows, we support the idea of an international conference for the solution of the problem, and are looking into ways to promote the matter, Gerasimov said, noting nevertheless that the Soviet Union still has no concrete suggestions.

Rogachev on Gorbachev LIAOWANG Interview

LD121735 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 12 Jan 87

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev speaking here today at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists noted that an interview by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to the Chinese weekly LIAOWANG is the first case in the past decades of the publishing of answers of a Soviet leader to a Chinese magazine.

The very address of LIAOWANG to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee with a request for an interview is an extraordinary and remarkable event, I. Rogachev noted. "We view it as another good sign, as an evidence of substantial gradual changes in Soviet-Chinese relations".

"The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee expressed satisfaction over the Soviet Union's contacts and ties with China, over mutually advantageous cooperation developing in various areas, positively assessed the talks that have been started, the establishment of a political dialogue. The question of prospects of Soviet-Chinese summit was touched upon", the deputy foreign minister said.

Igor Rogachev noted that during a conversation with President of the Republic of Zambia Kenneth Kaunda, Mikhail Gorbachev said in connection with a statement by Deng Xiaoping that such a meeting could be held in any place convenient for both sides. "We are ready to discuss at this meeting complex questions of bilateral and international relations and we are convinced that if we meet each other halfway, mutually acceptable solutions can be found", the USSR deputy foreign minister said. He said that Mikhail Gorbachev's interview is another evidence of the Soviet Union's openness in broad dialogue with China—at various levels and on the entire range of questions in the relations between the two countries.

In conclusion Igor Rogachev told journalists that the book by Deng Xiaoping "Fundamental Questions of Contemporary China" will be brought out in translation into Russian in the Soviet Union in a few days. It is planned to bring out somewhat later in the PRC Mikhail Gorbachev's book on perestroyka and new thinking, translated into Chinese.

Socialist Reaction Noted

PM121513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

[Roundup of reports by PRAVDA special correspondent A. Lyutyy and TASS dated 11 January: "Reassuring Prospects. Foreign Mass Media on CPSU Central Committee General Secretary's Replies to Chinese Weekly"]

[Excerpt] The replies of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to questions put by the editors of the Chinese weekly LIAOWANG were published in that magazine's second issue, dated 11 January, which carried a photograph of the Soviet leader and a facsimile of his signature. A detailed account of the replies carried by XINHUA has been published prominently in RENMIN RIBAO, organ of the CPC Central Committee, and in the newspapers BEIJING RIBAO, GUANGMING RIBAO, GONGREN RIBAO, and CHINA DAILY. In headlines formed from large characters, the leading PRC publications draw special attention to M.S. Gorbachev's statement that the change in the general political atmosphere in the world as a whole is the most important result of 1987.

What is being referred to, above all, are the results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Washington, whose historic significance the Chinese press undoubtedly and unanimously notes. An agreement to eliminate two classes of nuclear missiles was reached there for the first time, thereby initiating the process of real disarmament.

M.S. Gorbachev's replies are the central topic in the socialist community countries' mass media. The Soviet leader, a Hungarian television commentary states, made a realistic assessment of the world situation, at the same time pointing out that many obstacles still have to be overcome on the way to a secure world. The pointer has moved somewhat away from the danger mark, Bulgaria's RABOTNICHESKO DELO writes.

Among the various factors that have played a role in this process, it would be right to single out the contribution of world socialism to awakening the general human impulse toward improving and normalizing international relations, Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU points out. It goes on to cite the Soviet leader's thought that this contribution is directly linked with profound changes. Analyzing the course of restructuring in the USSR, Czechoslovakia's RUDE PRAVO writes, Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized that a very great deal will depend on the party at the present stage of the reform. The party will have to restructure itself seriously, put an end to substituting for state and economic organs, and change the forms of work. These questions will be resolved at the all-union party conference in the summer of 1988. [passage omitted]

News Conference Held on Soviet NOC Decision

PM121627 Moscow SOVETSKIY SPORT in Russian 12 Jan 88 p 1

[Article by V. Geskin and M. Dmitriyev: "Set Your Watches: The Countdown to the Olympics Is Under Way. Reportage From the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] The discussion was still in progress in the building on Luzhnetskaya Embankment where the USSR National Olympic Committee [NOC] plenum was being held, but the most impatient journalists had already appeared at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on Zubovskiy Boulevard. When the moment arrived to

begin the news conference by the leadership of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports and the Soviet NOC, the hall was full: Representatives of the Soviet and foreign press showed enviable interest in the impending meeting.

Yu. Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, presented the participants in the news conference to the journalists: M. Gramov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports and chairman of the USSR NOC; V. Gavrilin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports and first deputy chairman of the USSR NOC; A. Kolesov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports; T. Samolenko, honored sportsman and twice world champion in track and field athletics; Yu. Zakharevich, honored sportsman and many times world champion in weight lifting; Yu. Chesnokov, vice president of the International Volleyball Federation; and Yu. Titov, senior secretary of the USSR NOC and president of the International Gymnastics Federation.

The audience was then addressed by M. Gramov.

The plenum of the USSR NOC has just ended, he said. It made a decision on Soviet sportsmen's participation in the 1988 Summer Olympic Games.

Prominent figures in the Soviet sports world, chairmen of national federations, leading coaches, our representatives to international sporting associations, and famous sportsmen, writers, personalities from the world of the arts, and journalists took part in the plenum's work. The question of our participation in the Summer Olympics was very carefully discussed.

As is well-known, the national Olympic committees must answer the IOC invitation by 17 January. This means that the official statement on our decision will reach IOC Headquarters on time.

What led us to accept the invitation? We were guided primarily by the spirit and principles of the Olympic Charter. We support the aims of the Olympic movement: to promote the development of man's physical and moral qualities, which are the basis of sport; to cultivate young people in a spirit of mutual understanding and friendship with the aid of sport, thereby contributing to the creation of a better, more peaceful world.

We believe, M. Gramov emphasized, that the Olympic Games are a great sporting event and the property of all mankind, that they contribute to the task of improving the international climate, and that they are currently in the spirit of the time.

It was noted that the USSR NOC had again expressed its support for the DPRK NOC proposal to hold the Games in North and South Korea and also for the efforts made in this direction by J.A. Samaranch, president of the IOC. The USSR NOC believes that the door must be left open for continuing talks between North and South Korea. It is essential to find a formula which will not only ensure the success of the Olympics but also help to improve the situation. This is our principled stand.

The USSR NOC is sufficiently well-informed on how matters stand with preparations for the Games, from the documents sent by the IOC and international federations and from reports from Soviet coaches and sportsmen who were involved in the recent sporting events in Seoul. A considerable amount of preparatory work has been done there but, as our coaches and sportsmen have pointed out, there is still a considerable number of shortcomings and oversights.

...And so, there you have the main sporting news of the day: Guided by Olympic ideals and the interests of strengthening the unity of the international Olympic movement, the Soviet NOC has decided to accept the IOC invitation and send a Soviet sports delegation to the Olympics in September 1988.

Many of the correspondents were interested to know whether there are plans to send the Soviet Olympic competitors to the Far East for an acclimatization period before the Summer 88 Olympics, as the climatic conditions and time zone there are similar to those of Seoul; they also wanted to know how the team and the equipment are to be conveyed to the site of the sporting events.

As M. Gramov noted, some members of our team will indeed spend some time in Vladivostok and Khabarovsk, from where the athletes will be flown to Seoul. The remaining members will travel to the capital of the 24th Olympic Games from Moscow. An agreement on special charter flights has already been reached with the hosts of the Games, which will help to solve this task.

In addition to this, the ship "Mikhail Sholokhov" will be used to carry the necessary equipment to Seoul. For the duration of the Games it will lie not far from the South Korean capital and, if necessary, any of the Soviet sportsmen may spend a day or two on it for extra rest before the most important events. But like all the Olympic competitors, our athletes will live in the Olympic Village.

Naturally, when discussing the forthcoming events, it was hard to refrain from attempts to see into the future. For example, the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports and the USSR NOC was asked how many Olympic gold medals the Soviet team expects to win.

In principle I would not like to hazard a guess, M. Gramov remarked. Especially as, more often than not, every Olympic Games disproves what had seemed to be

the most well-founded predictions. As I have already said, the Soviet Olympic competitors have the objective potential to make a good showing in Seoul.

And what do the potential Seoul Olympic competitors themselves think on this score? And do they believe that world record-breaking wins are possible in the difficult climatic conditions of the host country?

It is good to break a record, T. Samolenko smiled. However, our main task is to win.

I agree absolutely with Tanya—our famous runner was backed up by Yu. Zakharevich, a no-less-famous weight lifter. Especially as the competition is expected to be particularly fierce. But if the opportunity to break a world record arises, we will try not to miss our chance.

All those present at the press conference were interested to know how the Soviet side regards Seoul's level of preparation for holding such a major, responsible sporting event.

M. Gramov stressed that approximately 20 Soviet sports delegations have traveled to Seoul recently to participate in various sporting events. Summing up their impressions, I can say this. The technical provision of all sports facilities merits a good appraisal. At the same time, however, I must mention the hosts' lack of organizational experience and point out that the judges' qualifications leave something to be desired. We will definitely draw the attention of the 24th Olympic Games Organizational Committee leadership and the appropriate international sports federations to these facts.

Journalists were interested to know how many Soviet sportsmen will be going to the Games? Approximately 500-520.

Other questions put by representatives of the Soviet and foreign press were also answered.

GDR's Honecker Pays State Visit to France

Meets With Mitterand

PM111643 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Questions of Disarmament at Center of Attention"]

[Text] Paris, 8 Jan—Questions of disarmament and the consolidation of peace were at the center of the attention of the participants in the first meeting held in the French capital between French President F. Mitterrand and E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, who has arrived here on a state visit. The sides noted the great significance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-and Shorter-Range Missiles signed last December and advocated the further continuation of the dialogue on questions of disarmament.

During the meeting, special attention was devoted to the question of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe (missiles with a range of less than 500 km and nuclear artillery). The GDR leader advocated discussion of this question in the very near future within the framework of the talks on conventional arms. However, the French president asserted that the French short-range nuclear weapons—the Pluton missiles and the Hades missile systems replacing them—are of a strategic, not a tactical nature within the framework of the French "nuclear deterrence" strategy. Therefore, according to him, the question of French short-range nuclear means cannot be examined during the talks on conventional arms.

The sides also touched on a number of other aspects of disarmament. E. Honecker recalled, in particular, that the Warsaw Pact states emphasized 11 December last year the need to do everything to ensure that the opportunities being opened up in Europe following the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles are not lost again because of the buildup and modernization of other types of weapons. E. Honecker and F. Mitterrand advocated the total elimination of chemical weapons.

The two heads of state also exchanged opinions on the situation in the Persian Gulf region, the Near East, Afghanistan, and Latin America.

Visit Summed Up

PM121247 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jan 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Results of Talks Summed Up"]

[Text] Paris, 9 Jan—E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, has ended his official visit to France. The GDR leader had talks with French President F. Mitterrand, Prime Minister J. Chirac, and Foreign Minister J.-B. Raimond. Today he met G. Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party. Conversations were also held with other eminent French politicians.

Summing up the results of E. Honecker's talks with F. Mitterrand, official spokesmen of the two delegations announced that the sides highly appraised the importance of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in December. They also unanimously welcomed the USSR and U.S. intention to reach an accord on a 50% reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals, on condition that the ABM Treaty is observed, in the first 6 months of this year.

E. Honecker and F. Mitterrand spoke in favor of the complete elimination of chemical weapons. Moreover, the GDR leader recalled the proposals put forward by the GDR and the CSSR on creating a nuclear-free corridor and a chemical weapons-free zone in Central Europe.

A statement by E. Honecker, released here at the conclusion of the talks, notes that the present visit contributed to consolidation of the climate of detente, trust, and good-neighborliness. Both sides believe, the document says, that the process within the CSCE framework is developing positively. They express a unanimous hope of a successful conclusion to the Vienna meeting of representatives from CSCE states. The sides spoke in favor of the earliest possible elaboration of a mandate for talks on reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

E. Honecker warned against attempts to undermine the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles by the creation [sozdaniye] of new military structures, and emphasized the need for further steps on disarmament in the sphere of strategic and tactical nuclear weapons and conventional and chemical arms.

Cold War 'Echoes' Seen in French View of GDR

PM121301 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 88 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov commentary: "GDR Flag in Paris"]

[Text] Paris, 11 Jan—In our time it is somehow even absurd to talk about a breakthrough in the diplomatic blockade around the GDR. It seems that this all happened a long time ago and that it would not occur to anyone to argue about whether the first worker-peasant state on German soil should be acknowledged or not. Nevertheless E. Honecker's official visit to Paris, which has only just ended, is the first visit to France by the GDR's top leader since its formation. E. Honecker was received as head of state by the Republic's President F. Mitterand, Prime Minister J. Chirac, and other officials. For three days running, the flags of the GDR and France fluttered side by side in the breeze in the center of the French capital, as usual in the course of important state visits. This symbolism can scarcely be exaggerated.

L'HUMANITE wrote on the first day of the visit that since the formation of the GDR in 1949, the French Communist Party [PCF] and all progressive forces have struggled to establish relations between France and the GDR and have advocated that they be raised to the very highest level. The word "struggled" is an accurate one. The GDR has hitherto had many enemies in France. This can be judged by the attacks from the right-wing press, particular from LE FIGARO. In an editorial devoted to the visit, it once again demonstrated its immutable loyalty to the hard language of the "cold war." Reading LE FIGARO, it turns out that the GDR leader's visit is not the result of an invitation accorded to him by France's leaders but an insidious Kremlin plot using the GDR as a Trojan horse to "neutralize the FRG," "weaken NATO," "denuclearize Europe," and, consequently, undermine "the security of Europe, including France."

Such topsy-turvy "logic" illustrates on the one hand the rightists' irritation that the visit has nonetheless taken place. On the other hand, it indicates their alarm regarding the peace offensive advanced by the socialists. This is assuming special significance and gaining increasing popularity in Europe in light of the Soviet-U.S. accords signed in Washington.

Before his trip to Paris, E. Honecker sent a letter to Chancellor H. Kohl proposing that an agreement be reached to freeze short-range tactical missiles and not modernize them further. At present Bonn is playing at "sitting on the fence." People at the highest official level in France stated right away that Paris would not support this initiative or make any commitment to freeze short-range missiles because, as far as France is concerned, they are not "tactical" but "prestrategic" missiles. People in our country say that this is just "splitting hairs." Using roughly the same scheme, Paris is trying to claim the right in advance not to participate in any talks on nuclear disarmament in Europe, especially on the question of tactical missiles, one of which, "Hades," is about to begin to be commissioned. Furthermore, Paris is also egging Bonn on, doing its utmost to foist on the latter its "nuclear umbrella" and the coordination of armed forces operations, right down to complete integration in the future.

The GDR leader urged Paris to support the steps to eliminate nuclear weapons adopted by the USSR and the United States and also the Warsaw Pact countries' peace initiatives. E. Honecker once again confirmed, in particular, the GDR's readiness to create a nuclear and chemical weapons-free zone in Central Europe. "There is no reasonable alternative," he stressed, "to peaceful coexistence."

In the course of the talks which have taken place, the French leaders did their utmost to try to avoid any concrete pledges in connection with nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless, the visit showed that Paris will not be able to ignore this process for long, just as it was once unable to ignore the existence of the GDR. The echoes of those times also reverberated during E. Honecker's visit. Paris has not as yet abandoned its attempts to lecture the GDR concerning human rights and its relations with the FRG.

The accords on the future development of a system of political consultations between France and the GDR, the development of trade, and cultural and scientific exchange were extremely important results. This is all being done on the basis of mutual advantage: the GDR

occupies a stable place in the world's top ten highly developed industrial states. People in the capitalist West, notably in France, are willing to buy its output.

Realistically evaluating the disposition of forces in Europe, France's leaders are proceeding to develop and strengthen relations with the GDR because they see this, as F. Mitterand pointed out, as a means of preserving peace, trust, and greater security with a smaller quantity of weapons in Europe. This is a sensible approach, and the GDR reciprocates this.

'Newsreel' Program on Arms Treaty, Other Issues
LD122205 Moscow World Service in English
1610 GMT 12 Jan 88

[From the "Newsreel" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Next, a look at some of the major developments on the world scene: A meeting between representatives of the two most powerful nations last year and the signing of the first pact to eliminate an entire class of nuclear arms has sparked hopes that 1987 could come to mark a turning point in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It also bodes well for improvements in the international climate elsewhere this new year. With a look at some of the major events in recent weeks, here with me in the studio is our observer Yuriy Reshetnikov. At their summit meeting in Washington last month, the Soviet and American leaders signed a treaty which calls for wiping out hundreds of deadly and highly accurate nuclear missiles. Considering the actual numbers each side was committed to eliminate, don't you think the Soviet Union was short changed?

[Reshetnikov] Well, I suppose some people might think that we got kind of a raw deal, having to sign a treaty on such terms. Indeed, in keeping with the treaty, the Soviet Union is committed to destroy more than twice as many missiles and warheads than the United States. But sheer numbers, however, do not tell the whole story. The important thing to remember is that the realities of our nuclear age do not make numbers our only concern. In this case I believe the Soviet Union was prepared to swap quantity for quality. Indeed, Pershing-2 missiles have a flight time of under 10 minutes to hit targets in the Soviet Union; while apparently we had no comparable nuclear capability to retaliate against the U.S. mainland with the same class of weapons.

[Announcer] Don't you think it's ironic and senseless that we had to go to all the expense and trouble of installing all these weapons to see them finally scheduled to go up in smoke within 3 years?

[Reshetnikov] I suppose you apply your question to both sides. I feel strongly that those missiles should never have been installed in the first place. To my mind, they appeared at a time when we thought that more was necessarily better, and I'm talking of the SS-20 missiles, which appeared there first. On the other hand, I don't think the only way to get them out was to introduce cruise missiles and Pershing-2's. The United States, according to one estimate, spent nearly $9 billion on the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles; and the Soviet Union probably spent a comparable amount on its SS-20's.

[Announcer] I suppose the United States and its NATO allies should have just paid out for the expense in order to remove those SS-20's, right?

[Reshetnikov] Well, I'll tell you—though only as a joke—seriously speaking, that problem could have been resolved through negotiations. We see there is nothing any more that can't be handled in a constructive manner agreeable to both sides.

[Announcer] I don't see how such an agreement would have been possible 5 or 6 years ago under the former leadership when the most famous Russian word known to Western negotiators was nyet.

[Reshetnikov] I think that the Russian nyet was just as frequently matched with the Western no. There was this vicious circle of (?many fears) which had to be broken. And this happened at a time when the more famous Russian words have become glasnost and perestroyka. Apparently the vigorous foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its readiness to seek agreements have been met with equal eagerness in the West; otherwise, no headway would have been possible.

[Announcer] Despite the scheduled withdrawal of more than 1,100 missiles from its countryside, Europe will be far from nuclear-free in the near future. Is this correct?

[Reshetnikov] That is absolutely correct. The intermediate-range nuclear forces accord, signed in Washington last month, deals with only one relatively small class of missiles: those with ranges of 300 to 3,400 miles. Thousands of other nuclear missiles, bombs, shells, cannons, aircraft, which comprise the tactical arsenals of NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries, are left untouched. Likewise, American and Soviet arms negotiators return to the bargaining table this week under instructions to try to complete a treaty reducing intercontintental nuclear forces, in time for the Moscow summit planned in the coming months. So there's plenty of work to be done. But the important thing is what we have broken the ground, and that is reason enough to feel optimistic about the prospect of nuclear disarmament.

[Announcer] Important as they are, nuclear matters, I am afraid, have taken up too much of our space, and I would like to turn our attention to some other subjects. And there's perhaps no more painful subject to discuss that the Soviet Union's continuing involvement in Afghanistan. It seems to me that we are beginning to see

some light at the end of the tunnel, that has stretched for 8 long years. Do you feel the Soviet Union is finally able to withdraw from that country?

[Reshetnikov] Yes, all indications are the Soviet Union is ready to leave. In the first days of the new year we saw a great deal of diplomatic activity in and around Afghanistan. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze turned up in Kabul unexpectedly. And his visit coincided with a similar mission to Pakistan by the U.S. Under Secretary of State Michael Armacost. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] How does the Soviet Union view the future system in that country? Is a pro—Soviet government one of the conditions for Soviet troop withdrawal?

[Reshetnikov] No, it is not. The Soviet Union made it abundantly clear that it is up to the Afghan people to choose their form of government. Of course, we have our legitimate security interests in that area. After all, Afghanistan is our neighbor. Throughout its history Afghanistan has always been a neutral country, and we expect it to remain that way.

[Announcer] We can't really expect the present antigovernment rebels would show much mercy towards Afghans associated with the government. Is the Soviet Union concerned about the possibility of a bloodbath once it withdraws its troops?

[Reshetnikov] Yes, that must be one of our concerns. The Soviet troops have tried to maintain order in that country. There is a possibility of once those troops are withdrawn there might be an increased bloodshed. Those rebels are not exactly liberal democrats, and I may predict that even with a peace settlement and the Soviet troops gone, the rebel groups will soon be fighting each other. So there have to be some guarantees that this situation is avoided as much as possible. However, given the good will and cooperation of the Soviet Union and the United States in guaranteeing peace in that country, an early settlement is possible.

[Announcer] With the new year, United Nations Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has renewed efforts to help end another conflict, the war between Iran and Iraq, and is exploring new ways on how to proceed, a United Nations spokesman said recently. Meanwhile, we've heard frequent criticism of the Soviet position in the Western news media with regard to ending the war. Specifically, the Soviet Union has been accused of opposing an arms embargo to the belligerent countries. Just how justifiable is this criticism, do you think?

[Reshetnikov] The Soviet Union is not opposed to an arms embargo. However, such an embargo would not necessarily help bring an end to the 7-year war. There are enough weapons in the pipeline, so to say, to feed the conflict perhaps for months to come. A decision to apply an arms embargo in keeping with our position will be dealt with by the Security Council, of which the Soviet Union is one of the five permanent members along with China, France, Britain, and the United States. In mid-December the Soviet Union voted for a Security Council declaration calling for new measures to restore peace. And this country supports all UN efforts to bring Iran and Iraq to the negotiating table. We believe that the United Nations and not national naval forces should be guarding the international waterway which is the Persian Gulf.

United States & Canada

Burns Deemed 'Relatively Moderate' ACDA Nominee

PM121309 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report dated 8 January under the rubric "24 Hours on the Planet": "United States"]

[Text] The White House announced officially today the nomination of General William Burns for the post of director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He will replace in that post K. Adelman, who resigned last month. Burns is presently U.S. deputy assistant secretary of state for politico-military affairs. During 1981-1984 and 1985-1986 he represented the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Soviet-U.S. talks on intermediate-range missiles. Comparing the "hawkish" views of the former director with his successor's views, commentators believe that Burns will take a "relatively moderate stand" on questions of arms control. His candidacy has now to be approved in the Senate.

Falin on Using 'Last Opportunities'

AU121251 Sofia ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 7 Jan 88 pp 1,6

[Article by Valentin Falin, "chairman of the NOVOSTI leadership": "Let Us Take Advantage of a Remarkable Opportunity"—" special for the daily ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME"]

[Text] Journalists, and even scholars, usually write in a critical spirit when discussing relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, and even between Russia and the United States prior to 1917. The period of Soviet-U.S. cooperation during World War II is an exception. This could be explained by the phenomenon of mutual lack of understanding, by the "curtain of ignorance".

After reading most of these publications, nonspecialists draw the following conclusion: These two states have always been rivals, and it is almost inevitable that they should remain so, if not enemies, in the future. To what extent is this conclusion justified? To what extent does it conform with history and with those specific opportunities and facts, which are much more varied than the scholars of the past have assumed?

If we do not go back to the remote past, although this would make sense, but dwell only on the events following the Great October Socialist Revolution, we can ascertain as follows:

The revolution in Russia in no way encroached upon the legitimate state interests of the United States. The hostile reaction by Washington to the October Revolution events was prompted by the ideological stand of the country's political leadership, as well as the forces prevailing in the U.S. economic sector, a result of the concepts propagated in those days, which attributed a special role to the United States as a missionary of the Western as well as of the Eastern Hemisphere: the armed intervention of the United States, its interference in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Republic, and its participation in the civil war on the side of the classes overthrown by the revolution, the emergence of plans for a new imperialist redistribution of the world by dismembering the Soviet Union—these were the well-known results of the situation.

The failure of the military intervention from abroad and other reasons prompted the United States in the second half of the twenties to search for an unusual answer to the epochal challenge. The United States became the initiator of the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 which rejected war as an instrument of national policy. The interest which the United States manifested in the late twenties and early thirties toward a halt to the arms race and a reduction of military arsenals certainly deserves some attention.

Objectivity requires us to point out that all Washington's constructive actions and probing in this respect met the most consistent support of the Soviet Union in the first place. It is precisely the mutual understanding about the importance of cooperation between the USSR and the United States "for the sake of mutual advantage and for the preservation of universal peace" that later created the foundations for establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries.

Objectivity prompts our statement, which is an undeniable fact, that the opportunities of reducing the influence of the military factor upon the development of the world situation were not used, because of the counteraction exerted against the American and USSR initiatives, especially by the governments of Britain, Germany, and Japan.

The Roosevelt administration, as well as the president himself, to judge from the available documents, were perfectly aware of the aggressive nature of German Nazism and imperialism. On several occasions they were even better informed on specific intentions of Hitler and his clique, than Britain, France, or the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the existence of extensive information did not prompt Washington to draw the only correct conclusion under those circumstances, namely to adopt measures for the mobilization of all enemies of militarism, so that a collective barrier may have been erected against war.

As a result of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in 1941-45 (which by no means developed in a one-way direction), Roosevelt eventually came to the conclusion that it was in the interest of the United States and was both necessary and useful to pursue relations of alliance with the USSR even after the victory for the establishment of a democratic order in the world. Roosevelt considered that one of the

most important elements of this order was the renunciation of the arms race and the drastic limitation of the military potentials of all states. A solid legal basis was established for the policy of such cooperation toward the end of World War II which, with goodwill and on a mutual basis, could have ensured an effective, mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States for several decades ahead.

The new Truman administration, which underwent a transition to the policy of "cold war" and to attempts to push the Soviet Union out of the positions acquired during the postwar period, was not a policy forced from abroad, but was prompted by the free will of the U.S. Administration according to which the nuclear monopoly of the country and the great economic superiority opened wide prospects for the implementation of its ambition for world domination.

The crisis of this policy in the sixties forced the United States to reconsider the situation and to think about a sensible alternative. This alternative was represented by the policy of detente and of averting nuclear disaster in agreement with the USSR. Nevertheless, this policy was not consistently implemented. On the one hand, it was supported by military detente while, on the other hand it was complicated by regional conflicts.

The present development perhaps gives the Soviet Union and the United States one of the last opportunities for conducting a policy in accordance with the epoch's objective requirements. The immediate future will show us how this opportunity will be used.

Bogachev on 'Burden' of 'Selective Deterrence'
LD122348 Moscow TASS in English 2324 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

A select presidential committee that over 15 months has been working out recommendations on strategy of the United States in the next two decades has arrived at the conclusion about the need to pay the main attention in the construction of the U.S. Armed Forces to the utmost development of conventional, non-nuclear weapons systems. It is suggested to place the emphasis on the creation of high-precision non-nuclear weapon system capable of destroying more effectively and selectively targets deep inside the enemy territory.

The U.S. press reports that a group of 30 U.S. experts led by Fred Ikle, U.S. under-secretary of defense, expressed the opinion that in future it will be inexpedient to rely on the use of nuclear weapons as a means of warfare, since their use will lead to self-destruction. The authors of the report which was referred to the U.S. President on Tuesday do not call on the administration to give up nuclear weapons. They say that nuclear weapons should remain an element of the "deterrent".

One gets the impression that the committee's recommendations are not based on a sober assessment of realities of the present and the Soviet Union's real aims. It is stressed in the report that "countervailing Soviet expansionism in any area" remains the chief task of the U.S. strategy, and that the USA and its allies will be faced with the menace of "Soviet attack". The Ikle group declares that the threat to the USA should be repulsed not at the U.S. borders, but at the borders of its adversaries.

The initial familiarisation with the report consisting of 70 pages enables one to draw some conclusions about the real aim of its proposals.

Fred Ikle and other members of the commission are apparently above all concerned over the quest for taking the U.S. military policy out of a "nuclear impasse". The main problem against which the strategists from the Pentagon now come up is the contradiction between the growing nuclear might of the United States and the impossibility of using it for achieving political aims without a mortal risk to the aggressor. THE WASHINGTON POST reports that the commission proposes, for instance, to use for an initial pre-emptive strike at intercontinental ballistic missiles silos not U.S. nuclear ballistic missiles but, say, high-precision cruise missiles with a conventional non-nuclear charge. The concept of a first pre-emptive strike, is, apparently, preserved. It is only that different means for dealing it are envisaged.

The new concept must give Washington a greater freedom of hands, flexibility, as they say in the Pentagon, in interfering in regional conflicts in the Third World. Operations patterned on the Grenadian or the Libyan one, but at a much higher level, are envisaged.

And, finally, the obvious aim of the strategy of "selective deterrence" proposed in the report of the presidential committee is to make the United States European allies in NATO shoulder a greater burden of military expenditures. The Pentagon complains that until now many of them avoided increasing allocations for the preparation for war, making references to their non-nuclear status.

Dobrynin Meets Political Leaders Group
LD091422 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 9 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 9 TASS—Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has received a delegation from the American Council of Young Politial Leaders (ACYPL) visiting at the invitation of the Committee of Youth Organizations of the USSR.

During the meeting a lively and frank discussion took place. The U.S. visitors showed a keen interest in this country's home and foreign policies at this phase and many of them, whose last time in the USSR was in 1971, were satisfied to note major and impressive changes here since those days.

In this connection the Americans asked questions on subjects ranging all the way from perestroyka, glasnost and foreign policies to humanitarian problems to the forthcoming 19th party conference.

They particularly stressed the historic significance of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States during which the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President signed a treaty for eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles that has come as a good sign of progress towards a real demilitarization of international relations.

They spoke openly about the big impression made on the American people by Gorbachev during his visit to Washington and expressed a hope in this connection for opening possibilities to steadily improve the relationship between the two countries.

Dobrynin gave detailed answers to the numerous questions from the American visitors, emphasizing that the far-reaching and thorough-going processes of renewing every aspect of life in Soviet society were very significant to bilateral relations between the USSR and the U.S. and to cardinal improvements in the international situation as a whole.

In the light of the results of the summit talks in Washington the meeting covered also the issues of further developing contacts between the people of the two countries, especially between young people, as a field where good traditions have already been formed, but large reserves still remain to be tapped.

Stress was made also on the growing importance of broader contacts between the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and U.S. Congress, in particular in view of the forthcoming examination of the issue of ratifying the INF Treaty.

In conclusion the American guests said their visit to Moscow had enabled them to get a better and more objective idea of Soviet policies and expressed their heartfelt gratitude to the hosting Soviet organizations for the hospitality and unfailing attention shown to them.

They called for continuing and extending such contacts and invited a relevant Soviet delegation to visit the United States.

Scientists Sign Research Cooperation Accord

LD122339 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1842 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 12 January (TASS)—Concern for ecology, the creation of new vacancies, forecasting natural disasters and a number of other themes of global interest will be the subjects of joint research by U.S. and Soviet scientists. Today they signed a new 5-year agreement on scientific cooperation.

A proportion of the 16 problems contained in the document is a continuation of research begun earlier, but the majority of the themes are included for the first time. They include planetary sciences, biotechnology, and the use of its achievements in agriculture, the development of new vaccines—Guriy Marchuk, USSR Academy of Sciences president, noted in a speech at the signing of the agreement. Joint research into AIDS, an illness representing a serious threat to people's health, was not given a separate point, but work in this area will be developed.

On behalf of the U.S. national Academy of Sciences, the agreement was signed by its president Frank Press. He shared Marchuk's opinion that the new agreement opens up great possibilities for mutual understanding and for achieving success in the area of information of mutual interest. The U.S. national Academy of Sciences president recalled that the United States and the USSR were the two leading powers in the field of scientific research and that combining the efforts of Soviet and U.S. scientists would promote raising living standards and accelerating scientific-technical progress in the two countries.

The agreement envisages the exchange of scientists, meetings, seminars, and the drawing up of joint research projects, including some in the mastering of space.

China

Moscow on Gorbachev's Interview With LIAOWANG

OW121928 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Respectful and dear listeners, the whole world is interested in Comrade Gorbachev's replies to questions posed by the Chinese magazine LIAOWANG. This interest is understandable because the replies touched on urgent, important questions for all people, primarily the question of building a nuclear-free world.

Today, such a world is no longer regarded as an illusion, as it was not long ago. Rather, it already has a realistic rough outline in view of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit held in Washington last December. At that summit, an intermediate-range missile treaty, the first of its kind, was signed between the Soviet Union and the United States, making a start in the process of real disarmament. Of course, it would be too premature to speak of the start of a fundamentally new recording of time. Speaking figuratively, however, it is a matter of fact that the hands of the clock indicating the world situation have retreated somewhat from the danger mark.

The general improvement of the political climate was the most important result of last year. However, there will still be a number of obstacles in the days to come. Chief among these are the stereotypes of the old thinking,

according to which a country's strength lies in its armaments. Socialism renounces the outmoded concept about the reliability of nuclear deterrence and chooses to bring about the prospects of building a world without weapons of mass destruction. The Washington summit was a starting point for marching toward this end. Opportunities to go on this path will open up prospects for a drastic reduction of Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear weapons, which involve about 95% of the nuclear weapons possessed by the Soviet Union and the United States. The above-mentioned reduction means a 50% cut in these weapons. This may be described as one-half of the nuclear-free world. To sum up, the powerful positive impetus which international relations received last year has opened up the possibility for a chain reaction to develop across the entire front of the limitation and elimination of armaments, be it nuclear or space arms, chemical or conventional arms.

The stereotypes of old military thinking are not the only conventions that must be done away with. Many disasters have resulted from the notion of a world divided into spheres of influence and from disregard for the widening gap between the rich West and the poor South. Also connected with this are the regional conflicts, which have taken the lives of some 10 million people within the past 40 years. These conflicts pose a threat to general peace.

Disastrous experience shows that the questions of our era cannot be solved by means of military technology, and the only solution is by political means. In our age, it is important not to transform the differences and contradictions into a pretext and justification for confrontation. This is one of the important principles of the new thinking. The present era requires a new moral code and a new principle. Today no one should formulate his long-term policy by jeopardizing others. It is necessary to join others in seeking a new balance rather than opposing others. Difficult as this is, it is the only correct road leading to general security and cooperation on an equal basis.

Comrade Gorbachev pointed out that in the cause of reforming international relations and solving the global questions of peace and security, a great deal depends upon the People's Republic of China, and that the Soviet Union hopes to cooperate with China in world affairs. He pointed out that the mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries is developing faster and faster and that a Soviet-Chinese meeting at the high level [su zhong gao ji hui wu] will be a logical development of the political dialogue between the two countries. In addition, Comrade Gorbachev stressed: By moving to meet one another, it is possible to find mutually acceptable solutions—of this we are certain.

Rogachev: No Barriers to Relations With PRC
OW130434 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Speaking at a news briefing given by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 12 January, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev said that the interview given by Soviet leader Gorbachev to reporters of the Chinese weekly LIAOWANG has been published in China. A station reporter attended the news briefing and filed the following report:

Comrade Rogachev said: The interview itself by LIAOWANG reporters is a major event [da shi]. We take this as a good sign of progress being made in Soviet-Chinese relations.

He pointed to the tremendous interest shown by the Chinese press and public to the interview given by the Soviet leader.

Comrade Rogachev told the reporters: In the interview, the Soviet leader pointed out that world socialism has contributed toward changing the world spiritual climate [jing shen qi hou] and normalizing international relations. The Soviet leader intends to cooperate in an all-round way with the PRC in controlling and destroying arms. Gorbachev said: Judging from every aspect, both sides have the objective need for a summit meeting. We are willing to discuss any questions on bilateral relations at such a meeting. We are confident that mutually acceptable solutions can be found.

In his short speech, the Soviet deputy foreign minister told the reporters: The book "Fundamental Questions of Contemporary China" by Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping will be published in the Soviet Union in a few days. Shortly afterwards, Soviet leader Gorbachev's selected works will be published in China.

In answering reporters questions, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev said: Talks on the resumption of relations between the two parties [liang dang] have not yet been held, but people believe that the relations between the two parties will be resumed sooner or later. As for the so-called three major barriers in Soviet-Chinese relations, the Soviet Union has never regarded these as barriers but as the situation in local conflicts. We are doing all we can to ease all the hotspots in the world, including the situation around [zhou wei] Afghanistan. Good progress has been made on the Cambodian issue. The Soviet Union has already withdrawn some of its troops from Mongolia.

Comrade Rogachev also said: In his Vladivostok speech, Gorbachev proposed to take measures to lower the level of military confrontation in the Far East and to start this process with the Soviet-Chinese border. Rogachev continued: We are ready to begin negotiations in this regard. We hold that negotiations will begin sooner or later.

PRC Decision To Create Zhou Enlai Museum

PM130943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Zhou Enlai Museum"]

[Text] Beijing, 10 Jan—A decision has been adopted on building a museum to Zhou Enlai, the Chinese party and state figure, who from 1949 until his death in January 1976 headed the PRC Government continuously.

RENMIN RIBAO reports that the museum will be built in the city of Huaian (Jiangsu Province). The museum's foundation-laying ceremony will be held on 9 March, the 90th anniversary of Zhou Enlai's birth.

Bilateral Cooperation in Civil Aviation

OW120631 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 8 Jan 88

[Text] A flight demonstration by the Soviet transport plane [name indistinct] is being held at an airfield in Beijing. During an interview with a reporter of our station, Li Zhao, deputy director-general of the Civil Aviation Administration of China, stressed that China and the USSR have a long tradition of cooperation in civil aviation and that the vista of this cooperation now is even wider. In this connection, our station's observer Tarov wrote:

It is a fact that Sino-Soviet cooperation in civil aviation began during the fifties. Aircraft designed by the renowned Soviet Ilyushin Design Bureau are well-known in China for their performance. The IL-14 aircraft, which is simple to maintain and has a safe flying record, has been used on many domestic air routes in China. The IL-18 type of passenger aircraft was used by the Civil Aviation Administration of China on its international routes, including the Beijing-Moscow route. Today, the IL-14 and IL-18 aircraft are still in use on China's domestic air routes.

In regard to the replacement of these aircraft, the time for renewal of Sino-Soviet cooperation has arrived. This process earnestly began during the middle of the eighties. According to a Sino-Soviet agreement, the USSR supplied China with the new IL-62 modern passenger aircraft. China's airline company has used this type of aircraft on the Beijing-Moscow air route. At the end of 1985 a demonstration of the Soviet Airbus IL-86 was performed in China. The present demonstration in China is of the IL-76 heavy transport plane. This aircraft may appear very soon on the Chinese commercial air routes.

Aircraft designed by another renowned Soviet aircraft design bureau, the Tupolev Design Bureau, also performed very well in China. According to a report last autumn, the People's Republic of China bought 20 TU-154M aircraft from the USSR. As early as the second half of 1985, the people of Beijing ceremoniously welcomed the arrival of the first aircraft of this type. Why does this type of aircraft attract the attention of the China Civil Aviation Administration? Regarding its technical performance, this type of aircraft is suitable for use in the northern and western parts of China because weather conditions there resemble those of the USSR.

Besides the above-mentioned aircraft, the AN-12, AN-24 and Soviet helicopters are also being used in China. In other words, Sino-Soviet cooperation in civil aviation has a sound foundation. On several occasions, both the USSR and China have issued statements on further cooperation in this respect. There is no doubt that this kind of cooperation has a bright future.

Northeast Asia

'Constructive Dialogue' Between Koreas Urged

LD121753 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1242 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Excerpts] Moscow, 12 Jan (TASS)—TASS correspondent Igor Bezrukavnikov writes:

It is already clear today that the first record of the 24th Summer Games has taken place: 153 countries have confirmed their participation in these major world competitions. But this in no way removes from the agenda the Korea question, the solution of which directly depends on the joint holding of the Olympiad by north and south.

Today's statement by the DPRK National Olympic Committee set out sufficiently clearly the essence of the problem. The International Olympic Committee [IOC] must display goodwill and undertake an exception to the rule: Postpone the date for handing in the 17 January application for the DPRK, taking into consideration the current position.

It is timely to recall that the national Olympic committees of the socialist countries, when accepting the IOC invitation to the 1988 games, stressed in their resolutions the importance of a favorable solution to the problem of the joint organization of the contest.

Following the provisions of the Olympic Charter, the games should promote the strengthening of peace and friendship all over the world. And the 24th Olympiad is special. Much is expected of it, primarily a blue sky over a white flag with the Olympic rings. From 1976 to 1984 many participant countries were not present at the Summer Games for a variety of reasons. Even now some journalists are trying to develop a polemic on affairs of days that have gone, tying it into the framework of relations between the USSR and United States. But it should be remembered here: The "i"s were dotted in this discussion by the Goodwill Games in 1986, which were the first comprehensive competition with participation

of Soviet and U.S. athletes after a 10-year break, and which confirmed the aspiration of athletes to meet and make friends, despite all the turnabouts in world politics. [passage omitted]

No one must cast a pall on the start of the 24th Olympiad. This is why a formula is so necessary which would leave the door open until the last minute for a constructive dialogue between DPRK and South Korea.

Demichev Meets Japanese Art Official

LD121825 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium met today in the Kremlin with (Tachigawa), the vice president of the Japanese gallery Kasama Nitido, who was participating in the opening of a Japanese art exhibition in Moscow.

In the meeting, the need to further develop cultural cooperation between the two countries was noted.

Near East & South Asia

West's Gulf Aims Hit, UN Role Supported

PM071655 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Pavel Demchenko "Viewpoint": "Paradoxes of the 'Tanker War'"]

[Text] First some figures: According to data from Lloyds of London, approximately 450 merchant ships have been fired at, damaged, or sunk in the Persian Gulf over the past 6 years. If you make yearly comparisons, most incidents occurred last year: A total of 178 ships were attacked, and 108 seamen died. For purposes of comparison, 80 attacks were carried out during the preceding 12 months, claiming 52 lives.

How is this? For it was last year that saw the greatest concentration of Western countries' warships in the Gulf—ships of the United States, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Italy—on the pretext of ensuring shipping safety. There are now about 80 of them there, including an aircraft carrier, a battleship, cruisers, torpedo boats, and minesweepers. An entire armada has been assembled in a comparatively small space of water, but the situation has worsened. Recently there have been tankers on fire in the Strait of Hormuz almost every day.

It is here that we encounter the No 1 paradox: As the number of "protectors" of freedom of navigation increases, so merchant shipping losses grow. The following conclusion would seem to suggest itself: The foreign warships have not intimidated the attackers; what is more, these ships protect only "their own" merchant ships, in order to ensure the flow of the necessary quantity of oil from the Gulf countries. In addition, the Americans especially guard Kuwaiti and Saudi tankers, while ships of "neutral" states, which have no one to protect them, find themselves under fire.

However, let us not be in a hurry to consider this viewpoint totally correct. Big politics loom behind the actions in the Gulf of the United States and its NATO allies, which appear indifferent to the fate of the "neutrals." This is why numerous statements by officials expressing their desire to end as quickly as possible the Iran-Iraq conflict, of which the "tanker war" is a consequence, are far from always backed up by actions.

As for the attacks on merchant ships by fast Iranian launches, this, too, is being used in a political game. The littoral Arab countries' notice is drawn to these attacks whenever the conversation turns to the expediency of having such a powerful U.S. fleet in the Gulf: But how could it be otherwise, they ask: It is protecting your interests. It has to be admitted that such assertions have elicited a definite response in capitals where there is a particular fear that an "Islamic wave" of the Iranian kind might reach them. Although not a single littoral country has agreed to make bases available to the U.S. Navy, the latter has, all the same, secured certain privileges.

In recent weeks, however, there has been growing disappointment in Arab political circles with Washington's actions, which strike many as having no prospects. In addition, the Israeli reprisals against Palestinians have led to increased anti-U.S. feeling in the Near East. Voices have again intensified in favor of the withdrawal of foreign warships from the Persian Gulf and, at the same time, in support of the Soviet proposal to create a UN naval force that could protect merchant shipping.

The United States is known to oppose the creation of such a force, although this position would seem to be manifestly at odds with the very idea of ensuring shipping safety and with the declared desire to bring the end of the Iran-Iraq war nearer. Big politics and global strategy are interfering here again. I will note, from my viewpoint, the two chief aspects. First, there is the obsolete reflex of confrontation with the Soviet Union and, second, there is the desire to keep control by any means over the Persian Gulf with its colossal oil riches and to prevent radical changes in the region.

It is most likely these considerations that account for the words of V. Walters, U.S. representative at the United Nations, who declared that the U.S. fleet will not leave the Persian Gulf "even if peace is established there tomorrow." It was evidently this strategy, against the background of changing sentiments in the Arab world and the criticism leveled in Congress at the Pentagon policy, that made U.S. Defense Secretary Carlucci set out on a week-long tour of Gulf countries.

Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud declared on the eve of the visit that the Cooperation Council of the six Persian Gulf Arab states "welcomes an international force to protect shipping in the region's international waters." It is not difficult to decipher the meaning behind that statement: It reveals both implicit displeasure at the U.S. policy and growing confidence in the United Nations. Evidently seeking to calm somewhat its own congressmen's alarm at the high cost of keeping the fleet in the Persian Gulf and, at the same time, to mollify its critics among the Arabs, the White House is planning, so the U.S. media report, to withdraw two or three ships from there. But that essentially changes little.

The potential of the United Nations, which is still being underutilized, could clearly play a considerable role in settling regional conflicts. The activation of this potential would mean not just abandoning separate, arbitrary actions but also making collective efforts, which is a very promising thing in international affairs.

Destroyer 'Stoykiy' Continues Gulf Escort Duty

PM111129 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[Captain 2d Rank L. Maslodudov radio dispatch under rubric "Our Ships in the Persian Gulf": "Abeam Abu Dhabi"]

[Text] Not every region in the Persian Gulf is equally dangerous for shipping. It is enough to analyze mass media reports on attacks on innocent ships to be able to single out two regions that are particularly unpleasant for seamen.

The first, at the northern end of the Gulf, is characterized by the great danger of hitting a mine. The second, not far from the Strait of Hormuz, is the area where innocent tankers and merchant ships stand the greatest chance of being attacked by Iranian launches. The launches approach the ship in question at high speed and use small recoilless weapons and missiles to attack the superstructure and then the side of the vessel. The ship is set on fire and the attackers quickly withdraw. According to foreign press reports, in 1987 alone a total of 178 ships were damaged as a result of these attacks or by mine explosions and 108 seamen were killed.

...Escorting Soviet tankers, the destroyer Stoykiy approached this region with the intention of passing through it in daytime. The ship's commander, Captain 3d Rank M. Volk, suddenly cheered up and became quite lively at daybreak, despite having spent the whole night on the bridge.

"The weather is deteriorating. That is good," he said, pointing to the white crests of the waves. "The launches will not come out into the Gulf, so we should get through the danger zone without mishap."

The destroyer Stoykiy has been on combat service in the Persian Gulf for months now. The crewmen of Soviet merchant ships are grateful to the Navy personnel. It is very symbolic that the ship bears the name of the Guards' destroyer Stoykiy, which earned for itself unfading glory during the Great Patriotic War. The crew of the new Stoykiy are performing frontline duty in the Persian Gulf, thereby building on the traditions of its predecessor. On this occasion as always, the Stoykiy confidently escorted Soviet civilian ships through the most dangerous zone. Lieutenant-Captain M. Chudik, Lieutenant-Captain S. Bezverkhniy, Lieutenant-Captain F. Kozlov, and many others vigilantly performed the watch.

We also escorted several tankers on the return journey from the Persian Gulf. We passed abeam the port of Abu Dhabi (UAE). A column of black smoke appeared on the horizon. Soon afterward we received a report that Iranian launches had attacked a Greek tanker and set it on fire.

In the Gulf of Oman, I radioed the captains of Soviet ships.

A.S. Voyshvillo, captain of the tanker Argun:

"Our tanker has sailed many a time in the Persian Gulf under the protection of the destroyer Stoykiy. We have been in some very difficult situations, and it is only thanks to the destroyer that we have managed to avoid been attacked. I would like to express my great thanks to our naval personnel."

A.P. Ponomarchuk, captain of the tanker Pamyat Lenina:

"Our crew completed its first trip into the Persian Gulf today. To be perfectly honest, it was not very pleasant. Only the presence of a Soviet Navy ship alongside, on constant alert to prevent any attack, allows us to work here calmly and confidently."

Israeli Government Extends Visas of Delegation

LD120950 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 0836 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Tel Aviv, 12 Jan (TANJUG)—The Soviet consular delegation that has been in Israel since 12 July last year will remain there for at least another month, as the Israeli Government has extended their visas by this amount. The visas were extended at the request of the head of the Soviet delegation, Georgiy Martirosov. The Soviet consular delegation has otherwise completed its work in connection with the property of the Russian Church and other consular affairs, which was why, it was announced earlier, it came to Israel. The Israeli Government is hoping that the USSR will approve a similar visit by an Israeli consular delegation to Moscow, but Israeli expectations that a renewal of diplomatic relations between the two countries could soon come about have not been fulfilled for the time being.

More on Trade With Afghanistan, Aid Documents

PM121619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commodity Turnover Expanding"]

[Text] Kabul, 11 Jan—A protocol on commodity turnover between the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan for the new year has been signed here, as well as exchange letters on the Soviet Union's rendering of economic aid to Afghanistan in 1988.

In accordance with these documents machinery, equipment, petroleum products, fertilizers, rolled ferrous metals, and construction materials will be delivered from the Soviet Union to Afghanistan, as well as foodstuffs and industrial consumer goods.

Natural gas, sheepskin and fur products, homemade artistic goods, olives, dried fruits, and nuts will be sent from Afghanistan to the Soviet Union.

These documents, Afghan Commerce Minister M.K. Jalalar said, embrace the most important spheres of cooperation, which is of a mutually advantageous nature.

French Journalist Abouchard Views Guillo Case

PM121530 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 13 Jan 88 p 9

[Own correspondent Kirill Privalov report under the rubric "Viewpoint": "The 'Guillo Case' and Jacques Abouchard's Logic"]

[Text] Paris—A French journalist who was convicted by an Afghan court a few years ago talks about the trial of his colleague in Kabul.

Jacques Abouchard was very surprised:

"How did you find me? I only came to Paris for a few days...."

A French journalist, he became a celebrity in Paris in October 1984. Sent by the Channel 2 television company to prepare reportage, Jacques Abouchard illegally crossed the Afghan border and was taken prisoner as one of a detachment of dushmans. Sentenced to 18 years' imprisonment, he was freed soon after the trial. Despite the humane decision by the Kabul authorities, Paris did not fail to blow up the so-called "Abouchard case." The clamorous tone of this action was quelled by the "central character" himself. In one of his first interviews on returning to France, Jacques Abouchard said: "I think the Communists in Afghanistan are worth more than the so-called 'rebels.' That does not mean that I am a communist myself."

Soon after his disastrous Afghan "mission," Jacques Abouchard was sent to Washington as Channel 2's own correspondent. Out of sight, out of mind, as the saying goes.... Now he turns up in France at the height of the new scandal whipped up here over the "Guillo case." Press photographer and cameraman Alain Guillo, working for the agency Sygma, secretly crossed the Afghan border for the ninth time, and had yet to fulfill—he claims—the mission set by his editorial office, which is eager for documentary testimonies about the dushmans' "feats," when he was handed over to the people's authorities by the dushmans themselves. The whole of Rasul Pahlavan's detachment went over to the Afghan Government's side.

"I do not take back what I said, and I am not afraid to tell the truth," Abouchard says now.

[Privalov] "Tell me then, are you not embarrassed by the fuss about the 'Guillo case'? Does not a journalist take an inevitable risk in violating another country's laws and deliberately coming into conflict with justice for the sake of 'hot' news?"

[Abouchard] "Professional risk is an integral part of our profession. This is true especially in the West, where sensation at any price is the main weapon in the competitive struggle between television channels, agencies, and publications. But I cannot compare my Afghan 'trip' with the 'Guillo case.' First, I do not know all the details about what happened to my colleague. Moreover, there have been changes in Afghanistan in the 3 years and more that have elapsed since my imprisonment and release. I will not get bogged down in details, which are hard for me to follow when I am in Washington. I will only say: Western journalists going into Afghanistan across the Pakistani border at their own risk are now in danger not only of being ambushed by the Kabul troops but also of being handed over by the 'rebels,' who are more and more frequently seeking reconciliation with the government."

[Privalov] "Yes, that is the result of the national reconciliation policy, which, by the way, is 1 year old in January. But there are many known cases of the dushmans dealing with journalists who report the truth about events in Afghanistan, which is not to the liking of those whom the West calls 'freedom fighters.' The whole world recently heard the news of the killing of BBC cameraman Andy Skrzypkowiak by fanatics from Hezb-e Eslami."

[Abouchard] "But why accuse Alain Guillo, and myself in the past, of espionage? That is a very serious matter: espionage in a time of military operations. Crossing the border—yes, that is breaking the law, and that crime must be answered for."

[Privalov] "As far as I can judge, under French law an accessory to a crime is punished almost as strictly as the criminal. But what would you say if, for instance, an

Afghan or some other foreign journalist secretly penetrated France and accompanied terrorists from an outlawed organization like, say, Action Directe, during their criminal acts? What would be the verdict of the judges when that 'neutral chronicler of events' was in the dock alongside the heroes of his reports?"

[Abouchard] "Oh, terrorism is a serious crime! Here, under French law, the penalty is 8-10 years minimum. But Guillo did not even have a lawyer in court!"

Does the scandal raised in Paris really amount solely to the absence of a French lawyer (there was an Afghan one)...?

All the facts indicate otherwise.

Afghan Front Leader Notes Cease-Fire Anniversary
LD121404 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Kabul January 12 TASS—On January 15, 1988, it will be a year since the day of unilateral ceasefire by the Afghan Armed Forces announced in keeping with the national reconciliation policy—the new political course of the country's leadership, 'Abdurrahim Hatef, chairman of the Central Council of the National Front, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Emergency Commission for National Reconciliation in Afghanistan, said in an interview with the BAKHTAR agency touching upon last year's achievements.

Despite all the complexities and barriers put up by the enemies of reconciliation, over the year more than 116 thousand former refugees have returned home from abroad, he said. Over the same period, more than 40,000 members of armed groups have gone over to the side of people's power, and another 114 thousand have supported the reconciliation policy, by signing protocols with the authorities on the observance of ceasefire terms. Thus, already more than fifteen hundred armed opposition groups have already embarked by now on the national reconciliation path.

A.R. Hatef noted that in the course of a year 3,000 villages have been peacefully placed under state control. The provinces Farah and Nimruz as well as tens of hundreds of districts, towns and villages have been proclaimed "peace zones". A total of 3,370 national reconciliation commissions have been formed in the country. They include nearly 6,000 former opponents of the government. Another 400 of them have become deputies of the organs of state power and administration in the provinces.

The important achievements in implementing the reconciliation policy have been the new laws and decrees passed by the government, the Afghan public figure said. Among them he made special mention of the laws of universal military service, private capital investments, labour, the press and the political parties, the decrees on amnesty under which 12,000 political prisoners have been released and the terms in prison of many others have been reduced. The main achievement of the Afghan people A.R. Hatef stressed, have been the adoption by the Loya Jirgah [Grand Assembly] of the Afghanistan's Constitution which has been rightly named the fundamental national reconciliation law.

Touching upon the repatriation problems, he noted that the state committee for the return of refugees has been set up with the powers of a ministry, "peace hotels" have been set up in a number of major cities. Temporary camps have been established at 22 border points. The state has appropriated tens of millions of afghanis for the reception, treatment, carriage, meals, first aid in food and industrial products to the repatrees [as received].

More Armed Afghans Accept Government Policy
LD121801 Moscow TASS in English 1318 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Kabul January 12 TASS—Another four armed groups have gone over to the government's side in Qades District of Badghis Province. On behalf of 250 former opponents of people's power their leaders declared preparedness to participate in the efforts to restore an atmosphere of peace and tranquility in the country. After a rally held on that occasion the members of the group turned over their weapons to representatives of the authorities.

A jirgah of the Hazaras of Balkh Province was held in Mazar-e-Sharif. It discussed questions in connection with the national reconciliation process. The chiefs and elders have decided to step up the participation of their tribes in the fight for ending war in Afghanistan. Household utensils which came to the province as a gift from the Surhan-Dariya region of Uzbekistan were distributed as a gift.

A new group of prisoners has been released in Farah Province. Analyzing the events in Afghanistan over the past week, the BAKHTAR agency notes that nearly 400 members of armed groups have gone over to the side of the legitimate authorities. One hundred and fifty Afghan families have returned to the country from abroad. The demand of the population of Khowst for foods and necessaries has been met.

Afghanistan's Khowst Road 'Open and Functional'
LD071834 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Mikhail Leshchinskiy video report from Afghanistan]

[Text] As we have already reported, the road to the town of Khowst has been opened in Afghanistan as a result of the routing of extremist armed formations.

[Leshchinskiy] On the road it is still not calm, of course. The remnants of the rebel bands are still firing from the surrounding heights. For this reason combat helicopters are in the air above the road. As you can see, armored equipment is standing at its posts. Nonetheless, the Kabul-Gardeyz-Khowst road is already open and functional. [video: close-up of road tanker and of crates marked made in the USSR] Peace convoys have now passed along this road of war. A large part of their load is being supplied as free assistance by our country.

[Video: Leshchinskiy shown standing near head of long stationary road convoy interviewing in turn two Afghan officers] Major General Gol Muhammad, as is appropriate for the chief of staff of the Rear Support Services of the Afghan Armed Forces, gave an interview with figures to hand. He stated in particular that almost 3,000 trucks have been mobilized in the transportation work. Before the end of the month, they will have transported some 24,000 tonnes of goods, over half of which will be foodstuffs.

Political worker Colonel Muhammad Nasim, continuing this conversation, noted the great political importance of the events around Khowst. The enemy has been routed by the decision of the Kabul Grand Assembly, at which all people were represented, Col Nasim said. This victory has shown that we are proceeding along the right path to establishing peace on Afghan soil, he said.

12th Aid Convoy Arrives

LD111521 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 11 Jan 88

[Text] Kabul January 11 TASS—The 12th column of trucks carrying foods and other cargoes arrived in Khowst District on Sunday, the BAKHTAR agency said. In the course of 12 days more than 15,000 tons of cargoes have been delivered there and are distributed among the population of the district.

Many of the country's provinces are a scene of rallies and meetings with the participation of representatives of all sections of the population, in whose course ever new populated localities are announced peace zones. The prisoners earlier convicted for anti-government activities are being released from jails. Over the nine months of the current Afghan year more than 500 members of armed groups have gone over to the side of people's power in Laghman Province. Talks are being held with another 13 groups. A total of 1,820 refugees have returned to their home parts from abroad.

Another crime has been perpetrated by extremist elements from among the irreconcilable bandit groups. They fired projectiles at residential neighbourhoods in Golbahar city. As a result a woman and two children were killed, a mosque and several houses were destroyed.

Caravans Arrive 'Daily'

LD122031 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Our correspondent Mikhail Leschinskiy reports from the Afghan district of Khowst.

[Begin recording] [Leshchinskiy] Caravans of trucks arrive here daily. Merchants, artisans, and small traders follow in their wake, bringing simple but much needed goods. All this changes life in these eastern territories adjoining Pakistan, literally right before your very eyes. Suffice it to say that prices on essential goods fell three to four times here, and this is not surprising. Two hundred tonnes of salt, 180 tonnes of sugar, and 600 tonnes of wheat alone have been delivered under our country's free aid. Clothing, footwear, machines, and equipment have come from Azerbaijan, which has assumed patronage over the district and and town of Khowst.

Such are the facts, yet attempts are being made in Pakistan and the West alike, to this very day, to deny them. Having at long last been forced to admit that the rebel formations have met with a military defeat, they are now saying that there is no road, that it has been destroyed, and that it is only tanks and armored vehicles that can make their way into Khowst. Indeed little, if anything, is left of the old, mountainous road with its worn out, gravel surface. But road workers, with their powerful scrapers and bulldozers, accompanied the attacking military units, under the hail of bullets and the threat of mines. Here, as ever, be it in battle or in hard times, the Soviet people stand together with the Afghans.

Comrade Colonel, I understand you are an adviser to the engineering service of the Afghan Army. I have a question for you. What is the condition of the road surface, and what tasks are currently being carried out here?

[Colonel N.A. Goncharuk, identified by caption] The road represented a rather complicated section, if you imagine that along this section 17,500 cubes [kub] were rubble and 1,500 were [word indistinct] and there were sections where manual labor had to be used along with machinery. Here there are mainly Afghan comrades. Soviet comrades are busy clearing mines and, naturally, we too are taking part in this work. The work is now almost complete.

[Leshchinskiy] So what is the task now?

[Goncharuk] To continue supporting the caravans, the traffic operations along roads of economic importance so as to maintain constant traffic. [end recording]

[Video shows truck in small town, a minibus, wooden crates with labels reading "Made in the USSR by Vostokintorg VIT" and others; trucks seen driving along road, military vehicle and tank; roadworks, earthmoving machinery and the colonel being interviewed]

Program Views Veterans of Afghan Campaign

OW130815 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2230 GMT on 9 January 1988 carries the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program, presented by correspondent Boris Smirnov and devoted to veterans of the Afghan campaign. The program opens with shots of a truck convoy at the Afghan border; one of the trucks is shown carrying steel pipes and bags of some unidentified material. Video then cuts to show a team of soldiers in uniform repairing a road, while Smirnov says that "they were called there to help, to support the Afghan people in trouble, which means to share it." Video then shows bags being unloaded from a train, while Smirnov says that the defenders are not only brave persons but also kind and generous ones.

Video shows a construction site in Afghanistan, then cuts to show Pskov's streets, the Pskov kremlin, and a meeting and exhibition held in Pskov in November 1987 and devoted to internationalists who performed duties in Afghanistan. As video shows soldiers in uniform and a highly decorated war veteran, Smirnov says that these soldiers "may have some feelings of guilt, for they returned, but did the others?"

Video then shows an interview with retired Sergeant A. Yelanskiy, who says that after he returned from Afghanistan, he looked differently at the merits of participants of World War II. Video shows Yelanskiy at his working place in a machining shop, then two other Afghanistan veterans of a shop next door, and then cuts to an interview with brigade leader Yakovlev, who says that there are 16 ex-soldiers from the Afghan contingent now working at the plant. He lauds their attitude towards work, and says that, "because of their modesty," they do not speak much about their military service.

Video then shows an interview with Lieutenant Colonel Glushko, who talks about a battle against rebels, and then an interview with former military medical assistant Shkryabinets, now a train conductor, who proudly talks about about the military exploits in Afghanistan as a repetition of those of the defenders of Pskov's soil. Video then cuts to show a concert of a military ensemble performing a song about the Afghan war.

As video cuts back to the continuation of the Glushko interview, the latter speaks about the awards he received. Video then cuts to former machine gunner Gvozdev speaking about meetings with other veterans, then cuts back to Glushko, who speaks about his feelings of guilt towards the mothers of fallen soldiers, his correspondence with soldiers' parents and, later, with soldiers. Later he compares those who fought in Afghanistan with those who did not, and lauds the former.

Smirnov is then shown interviewing Gvozdev's mother. She says that, after her son's return from Afghanistan, he got married and has a son, but they all still live in one room. Video then shows Syrtsov, deputy chairman of Pskov ispolkom, being interviewed by Smirnov. He says that "it has generally been planned to investigate the housing problem."

As video returns to the Gvozdev interview, the latter quotes a woman asking at a discussion meeting: "Would it not be better to quietly bury all these things—all this Afghanistan and all that happened there—and forget, forget, forget?" But Gvozdev says that, at least for the sake of those who perished there, these events must not be forgotten.

Video then shows a group of former soldiers, with Yelanskiy disapprovingly saying that there were soldiers who tried to avoid being sent to Afghanistan or tried to be transferred from there, and affirmatively answering Smirnov's question if there were any cowards in Afghanistan. Video then cuts to show Lieutenant Colonel Gushchin, military teacher of a Pskov vocational school, who says that in his school all information about graduates who had fought in Afghanistan were being placed on a board devoted to the patriotic war. Video cuts to show the Pskov landscape and that of Afghanistan, with shots of an MI-8, field guns, BTR machines, and unidentified tanks.

Video then shows a group of Afghan veterans, who had formed a club, being interviewed by Smirnov on the subject of opening a bank account to collect funds for a memorial to soldiers who had fallen in Afghanistan; they indicate that they are experiencing difficulties with their project.

Video again cuts back to Glushko interview, who tells about a wedding celebration he attended in Afghanistan when one of his soldiers was marrying a daughter of a rebel leader; he says that at the ceremony he tried to persuade the leader to change sides; the latter later "was tortured, beaten, and taken away to a ravine" by other rebels. "He, in principle, sided with our position. He was ready to change sides," continues Glushko. Smirnov then shows Glushko some photos and a recording he secretly made during a battle when he visited Glushkov's detachment in 1985.

As video cuts to a discussion with a group of veterans, Yelanskiy says that they keep contact with each other, and that this increases their club's opportunities.

The program ends with information on the veterans club's address and another Afghan song from the above-mentioned concert.

Astrakhan's Ties With Afghan Province Viewed

PM111610 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 January 1988 in its First Edition carries on page 3 a 1,300-word Astrakhan-Moscow dispatch from special correspondent V. Yudanov under the heading "Myths of the Dushman Agitators Dispelled: Patronage Ties Between Astrakhan Oblast and the Afghan Province of Farah Are Strengthening." Yudanov outlines the nature of the patronage ties and the experience gained through the exchange of delegations between the oblast and Farah Province. Afghan guests in Astrakhan, he notes, "were pleasantly surprised to find that Astrakhan's Muslims have wide opportunities for religious observance and that mosque buildings have been declared historic and taken under state protection. Dushman agitators and radio stations located in states bordering on Afghanistan are constantly talking about the 'oppression' of Soviet Muslims." Yudanov quotes Yunus Nabiullin, imam of Astrakhan mosque No 2: "The violence and killings perpetrated in Afghanistan by dushman gangs under cover of the green banner of the Muslim religion have nothing in common with the fundamental principles of Islam. Like all Soviet people, Astrakhan Muslims condemn the bandits' actions and welcome the course of national reconciliation pursued by the people's power. On behalf of the entire Muslim community, I wish to express support for direct contacts between the oblast and Farah province. Astrakhan Muslims will participate to the extent of their ability in giving help to their fellow believers and brothers...."

Briefs

Gift Sent to Afghanistan

Freight valued at R1 million has been sent to the Republic of Afghanistan by industrial and agroprom enterprises in Orenburg Oblast. It consists of agricultural equipment, construction machines, machine tools, and equipment for school study rooms. The gift from the people of Orenburg is intended for the inhabitant's of Nangarhar Province. The oblast and the province have established direct friendly ties and economic, scientific and technological, and cultural ties. Afghan power engineering workers and specialists of other industries of friendly Afghanistan will attend special courses in the south Urals. [Text] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 6 Jan 88 LD*]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Angolan, Cuban Event Linkage Called 'Notorious'

PM121641 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Tyurkin dispatch under the rubric "Correspondent Comments": "Establishing a Link. Or, Perhaps, Getting Bogged Down?"]

[Text] Luanda, 8 Jan—The next round of Angolan-U.S. talks on ending the conflict in southern Africa is to be held in January. Like all the previous talks, it seems these could again be fruitless because of the notorious "linkage."

"Notorious linkage." This is a very common combination of words in commentaries on southern Africa and, in my view, it needs to be commented on itself. When my newspapermen colleagues say "notorious," they frequently mean something more than just "so-called."

Judge for yourselves. We are speaking of one of the most protracted regional conflicts. For the RSA aggression against independent Angola is simply the 12-year continuation of the wars in Portuguese Angola, Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe), Mozambique, and Namibia. Incidentally, to this day peace still does not exist in any of the countries enumerated: It is not in vain that they are called "Frontline." Neither is there peace at the very seat of the aggression—in the RSA. The prospects for the escalation of this conflict are more than real.

Plans laying the foundations of a just peace settlement, which could begin implementation even tomorrow, are equally real, have been drawn up in detail, and have been approved in the world community's top body—the UN Security Council. Let us note that practically everyone agrees, at least verbally, with these plans. So what, then, is the matter? That same notorious "linkage" is the matter.

This political-diplomatic wonder of the 20th century saw the light of day in the U.S. Department of State African Affairs Bureau thanks to the personal efforts of Chester Crocker, assistant secretary of state for African affairs. It was formulated as follows. The decolonization of Namibia and the withdrawal of RSA troops from its territory are to be linked to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. In this situation the Cubans leave Angola first, and then the implementation of UN Security Council resolution 435 on the granting of independence to Namibia begins.

The essence of this approach is that two quite unrelated problems are linked here and the aggressor and the victim of aggression are equated. At the same time, it is proposed that the victim of aggression renounce the right to defend himself before the aggressor returns to his initial lines. For Pretoria unleashed hostilities against Angola in 1975 on the eve of the proclamation of independence by sending in a mechanized strike column manned by its own regular units, mercenaries, and collaborationists from the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola to take the capital. It was then that the Angolan Government officially invited Cuban troops to repulse the external aggression—in full accordance with the UN Charter. Those troops remain in Angola to this day. They hold exclusively defensive positions, not coming near the border with Namibia, and will be withdrawn as soon as aggression against Angola ceases. One wonders what the connection is between the Cuban troops and Namibia? I am convinced they are unrelated.

In a certain sense the "linkage" is brilliant. Its brilliance consists in its absurdity, and it cannot be realized by very virtue of its unrealizability. Consequently, a peace settlement in Angola, in Namibia, and in southern Africa generally can be blocked ad infinitum. The question arises: Is this not just what Washington and Pretoria require?

For they have no need at all of an independent Namibia and a peaceful, prosperous Angola. Consequently, they need to create a situation in Angola that will make a Cuban troop withdrawal impossible! To plant bandit formations all over the country, organize their supply, provide them with military cover, and not ease off direct military pressure on Angola.

So, the "linkage" is, if not the "perpetual motor" of aggression, certainly a "perpetual brake" on a settlement.

However, let us ask this question: Will the war, which has gotten bogged down in the U.S. "linkage," not boomerang on its own "authors"?

East Europe

Further on Jakes Visit; Tours Frunze District

LD121414 Prague CTK in English 1240 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow Jan 12 (CTK correspondent)—Czechoslovak Communist Party general secretary Milos Jakes today visited the Soviet Communist Party committee in Moscow's Frunze District, being accompanied by CPSU Politburo member, Central Committee secretary and Moscow city committee first secretary Lev Zaykov.

First secretary of the party district committee Vyacheslav Terentyev acquainted the Czechoslovak guest with the activity of the working people of the district in the implementation of the conclusions of the party 27th congress and their share in the economic, social and cultural development of the Soviet capital.

For nearly 20 years, the Frunze District has maintained close friendship relations with the third Prague district which will be further developed in the nearest future by establishing direct contacts between their enterprises and scientific institutions.

Milos Jakes pointed out that the Czecholosvak Communist Party approaches the restructuring of all spheres of the life of society with awareness of responsibility for solving the tasks which are faced by all socialist countries.

The deep changes express the revolutionary continuity in the Czechoslovak Communist Party policy. Their aim is to raise the country's socialist society to a qualitatively higher level.

The intentions of development are based on extending economic cooperation with the socialist countries. Of prior importance is to keep the dynamics of mutual relations with the Soviet Union, Milos Jakes stressed.

Later in the day, Milos Jakes visited the exhibition of successes of the Soviet national economy. He was accompanied by Lev Zaykov and deputy premier and chairman of the bureau of the Soviet Council of Ministers for engineering Ivan Silayev.

Milos Jakes highly appreciated the quality of the exhibits, pointing to the significance of close cooperation of Czechoslovak and Soviet engineering enterprises.

Comments on Talks

LD122057 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1730 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Interview with Milos Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, given to unidentified reporters of Czechoslovak Television, RUDE PRAVO, and CTK in Moscow; date not given; conducted in Czech—recorded]

[Text] [Question] Comrade General Secretary, what is your view on the course of the meeting and results of talks with Comrade Gorbachev?

[Jakes] I would say that it was a very useful meeting, and a necessary one, also concerning the fact that I took over the office of general secretary only recently and that it was necessary to hold consultations about a joint approach on a number of areas of joint interest. I would like to say that our meeting took place in a truly informal, comradely, and open spirit. We touched upon all sides of the policy of our cooperation and the policies of our parties. This is not by chance. We are going along the same path. We wish to accelerate socioeconomic development in the interest of the life of our people. They must have opportunity, the extensive opportunity to speak about it, because they will also bear immediate responsibility for their activity, for example, in the factories. The fact that the Soviet Union set out on this path earlier and has a number of good experiences is of great importance for us.

On the other hand, what also matters is to once again emphasize and demonstrate the support of the policy of the CPSU which is very close to us whether concerning internal policy of international policy, and in particular also to make further steps toward the all-round development of cooperation in all areas of activity of our communist parties. This is one of the important prerequisites, in particular for us, so that the work goes well for us.

[Question] What areas and the concepts in economic cooperation with the Soviet Union will be developing in the most immediate period?

[Jakes] It can be said that we are not starting from scratch in this cooperation. It is very extensive cooperation, and specialization on our part in relations to the Soviet Union is also extensive, in the export of some important commodities. At the moment the insufficient thing is the new form of cooperation. That means direct cooperation, and this also concerns the carrying out of a division of labor between the Soviet Union and us. So one of the most important measures is to work out a concept of this division and labor between our country and the Soviet Union for 15 to 20 years and to also link this with work on this concept within the CMEA's framework. This is exceptionally important. On the other hand, the forms which we have been using up to now will not be enough for us, and the aims of this cooperation will also be insufficient. Up to now, in practice there has been implementation of an intersector division of labor; that is, their raw materials and energy for our machinery and consumer goods. That was the basis of it. This possibility is practically exhausted. We must save raw materials and energy. That is our policy; that is, our policy is not to increase the consumption. The possibilities of the Soviet Union—and everyone is pressing them here—are also limited, and so we must go into the internal sector division of labor. That is, we must begin an exchange of machinery, new technology, and partly begin an exchange of consumer goods and food specialities. This is the new course on which we are embarking here. We are also concerned with completely new forms of this cooperation. This concerns in particular the things that have already been emphasized; that is, embarking on the path of direct relations between our enterprises. This demands the removal of various bureaucratic barriers which prevent this. These steps are being taken. We must also approach the building of joint enterprises faster, and we are at the very beginning of this, and where necessary the building of enterprises with the participation of third countries, in some cases also developed capitalist countries.

We will continue to participate in the integration actions which are the gas and metal ores. In the future we wish to make the transition to areas which no longer concern the raw material base but those which above all concern the production of goods; that is, the processing industry. This is the new thing. It is not an absolutely new thing, but it is necessary to make faster progress in this; I would say that the discussion was aimed at looking at such possibilities. A number of such topics arose, and it will be necessary to evaluate them more deeply.

This is one area. But we do not want to stop with the economy; we want all-around cooperation. I would say we want to deepen mutual cooperation between our people, so that they get to know each other better, so that tourism grows; it is necessary to create the conditions for all this. We also gave attention to this. It is also necessary to develop the attention given in the area of ideological work. I am not thinking of ideological work itself but this concerns practically its whole superstructure as part of it, in the areas of culture, education, media, and art. All this is exceptionally important, and we agreed we will work out a joint document, in the same way that we work on economic documents, about the development of this cooperation. I think this is a significant step, a step which I would say is in its own way of a new quality. It will be very important for us to realize such a program; it is needed and it will benefit both coutnries.

We also evaluated a number of questions which not only concern such large national economic problems but also human problems. For example, there was the Soviet Russia exhibition in Czechoslovakia. Exhibiting there was that man (Yelizaret) who extends human bones; also exhibiting was an eye doctor. We also evaluated this, and we think it appropriate—we hold the same view on this—for them to come to Czechoslovakia and possibly set up some kind of clinic there, to carry out complicated operations, so that our doctors can learn such skills. That has a different effect on people's lives because there are a number of people who need such operations. So I would say that truly in the humanitarian area, in the human area of cooperation, this concerns people not indirectly but in an immediate way. We will also take such steps in other areas.

We also exchanged views on international policy. In some areas there is absolute agreement. We intend to come forward with a number of initiatives which would contribute. I would like to recall one which the Soviet comrades supported. In a few years it will be 400 years since the birth of Comenius. So, for example, why not have a world or European conference of pedagogues in Prague with the aim of deepening the education of youth toward peace. There are other areas where Czechoslovakia can provide its own suggestion. We do not always have to wait—and the Soviet Union emphasizes this—to see what the Soviet Union will put forward. On the contrary, the Soviet comrades are requesting initiatives from individual countries in this, and we have this possibility. It is not a small possibility in this area.

This also concerns questions such as a look at our year 1988, which has been created, so to speak, for the development of ideological work, for highlighting our history: the 70 years of the Republic, 40 years since the victory of the working people, 50 years since Munich, 20 years since the crisis development.

Here, also as far as the crisis development is concerned, our viewpoints agree. There is nothing to be changed in this area. We have not condemned anyone generally for a long time now; we have simply said that everyone has the possibility to participate on a socialist basis in public life, to work for the benefit of socialism. I think that here we have a wide, truly wide base so the cooperation develops in all areas. There is an agreement of views on fundamental questions. There is also the standpoint that it is necessary for everyone to approach solving their problems creatively, so that things are not simply dogmatically transferred. Everyone has their own historic development even though in the main and decisive thing

the tendencies remain the same and in some cases even the methods with which it is realized are similar. From this viewpoint, the experience of the CPSU is of immense importance for us.

We were also convinced of this during a meeting with the officials of one of the districts of Moscow when they gave us an account of their experiences of how they are working for the realization of party policy; that is, restructuring and democratization; how under these conditions the party functions, what they give their attention to, and how they act.

[Question] I would like to ask with what personal impressions you are returning home. These are not usually part of official communiques.

[Jakes] Well, they are very good impressions. It is true they cannot be expressed in any communique. I would say we were received everywhere in a very friendly way as a close ally, as a friend. Comrade Gorbachev himself has a sort of personal charm. He is good to speak to; he talks in a practical way, and he does not force his views on others. He argues in a factual way, and he is willing to listen to views and to discuss them. So talks with him are of a creative sort: A man gets ideas about what needs to be improved, what must be done; suggestions occur to one. The openness with which the talks took place, and in the final analysis also the open meetings with Comrade Zaykov, with Comrade Ligachev, or even at the district party committee, or at the engineering exhibition which we visited where they exhibit products made in the last 2 years which represent the best in the world or a close to the best in the world, all this left me with a very good impression and only confirmed what we all now: It is necessary to develop cooperation with the Soviet Union and to value it very much on our part, because I would say it is the foundation of stability, the development of Czechoslovakia and also the fulfilment of our goals.

Naturally, we ourselves must also work on speeding up socioeconomic development and making use of their rich experience on their path of restructuring and democratization. So I am very pleased. I am leaving the Soviet Union with feelings that there is much still to do; there are many great reserves in cooperation which could speed our progress forward, not only in our own interest but also in the interest of the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole. In the international area our activity, our participation is valued. Simply put, the whole conversation invited us to go forward more aggressively with the belief that we in Czechoslovakia are capable of it, and that much that faces us can be achieved jointly with the Soviet Union.

I would like to add one thing: Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev asked me to pass on, not only to our leadership and Communists but all our people, his best wishes for much success and good health which I do with great pleasure.

[Question] Comrade General Secretary, sincere thanks for the interview.

Sends Gratitude Telegram

LD121428 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 1300 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Milos Jakes, CPCZ Central Committee general secretary, today ended his working visit to the Soviet Union and left Moscow for home.

From aboard the aircraft he sent a telegram to Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. In it he voiced his sincere thanks to the party's Central Committee and Mikhail Gorbachev for the warm reception and comradely understanding which he encountered in the course of his visit. Comrade Milos recalled in the telegram that mutual talks had taken place in the spirit of the full unanimity of views and confirmed the full resolve further to intensify fraternal relations and cooperation in implementing the strategy of acceleration of social and economic development both in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, revolutionary restructuring, and democratization of public life.

Honecker Appeal Will Find 'Positive Response'

PM111115 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov article under rubric "From the Socialist Countries: Events, Facts, Commentaries": "GDR Proposal"]

[Text] Berlin, 6 Jan—Socialist states work on the basis that the opportunity to contribute to disarmament is open to any country. The Soviet Union's initiatives play an enormous role, as is well-known. Proposals from other members of the Warsaw Pact have also prompted a broad response throughout the world.

Yesterday Berlin—the capital of the GDR—addressed a new appeal to Bonn: to get down to the task of solving topical problems concerning European security. The appeal is contained in a letter from E. Honecker, leader of the GDR, to FRG Chancellor H. Kohl.

The line of direct contact between the two military blocs—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—follows the border between the two German states. This means the GDR and the FRG can play a very substantial role in the task of strengthening peace. For example, as the GDR has suggested, the two states could speak out clearly in favor of ensuring that the total elimination of the types of nuclear weapons covered by the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in Washington is not depreciated or compensated by the introduction or expansion of other weapon systems.

With this aim in mind, the GDR proposes that the two German states be rid of nuclear systems with a range of up to 500 km. In other words, no nuclear weapons, not

even battlefield nuclear weapons, must remain in their territory. Conventional armed forces and arms in Europe must be simultaneously reduced. It is also a question of mutually rejecting the modernization of long-range weapon systems.

There is no doubt that the GDR's proposals will find a positive response and understanding among the European public. According to W. Stuetzle, famous Stockholm International Peace Research Institute director, they are "a pointer in the right direction."

It is natural that the GDR leader's message should also raise such a topical issue as the elimination of chemical weapons in the region and the fight to see them destroyed and totally banned. Attempts to put the brake on the locomotive of disarmament, which has just gotten started, include the U.S. decision on the production of binary chemical weapons. It is no secret that there are plans to station this new lethal ammunition primarily in the FRG.

The letter from E. Honecker shows that, as always, the GDR is aware of its responsibility for peace and security in Europe and takes it extremely seriously. It is ready for dialogue and for seeking solutions in the interests of the peoples on this continent. It is clear that the GDR leader's visit to France—beginning tomorrow—will be conducted in the same spirit.

Vorontsov Heads Delegation on GDR Visit

PM130849 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation of CPSU party workers headed by Yu.P.Vorontsov, CPSU Central Committee Culture Department chief, visited the GDR on 4-10 January where it was familiarized with the SED's activity in fulfilling the 11th party congress' decisions in the cultural sphere and its experience of working with the Republic's artistic intelligentsia.

The delegation was received by K. Hager, Politburo member and SED secretary.

Presidium Awards Order of Lenin to Husak

LD090826 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 9 Jan 88

[Text] We have received a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree. It says:

Comrade Gustav Husak, CSSR president, is awarded the Order of Lenin for his services to the development of fraternal friendship and cooperation between the people of the CSSR and the Soviet Union and for his big personal contribution to the strengthening of peace and socialism and in connection with his 75th birthday.

Leaders Recognize CSSR's Husak's Birthday

PM111407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[Soviet leadership bodies' birthday greetings to CSSR's Husak]

[Text] To CSSR President Comrade Gustav Husak

Dear Comrade Husak!

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium cordially congratulate you on your 75th birthday.

Your entire life is an example of selfless service in the interests of the people and unshakable loyalty to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Soviet people honor you as representative of a glorious generation of Communists who waged a selfless struggle against fascism, were present at the creation of new Czechoslovakia, and devoted and continue to devote all their energy to the affirmation of socialist ideals. You played an outstanding role in the defense of revolutionary gains and the elaboration and implementation of a course aimed at the country's confident advance along the socialist path and at boosting the economy, culture, and the working people's prosperity.

Thanks to your major theoretical and political activity, you enjoy deserved prestige within the international communist and workers' movement.

With particular emotion we pay the credit due to all you have done to develop and strengthen our parties' close collaboration and the friendship and cooperation of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

We wish you, dear Comrade Husak, good health and successful activity for the benefit of the fraternal Czechoslovak people.

CPSU Central Committee

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Marchuk on Polish Science Cooperation

AU111326 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 6 Jan 88 p 2

[Interview given by Guriy Marchuk, Academy of Sciences president, with TRYBUNA LUDU's Jerzy Sieradzinski: "There Is No Restructuring Without Science"—Warsaw, date not given]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Sieradzinski] What can one say about cooperation between the USSR and Polish Academies of Sciences so far? In what scientific spheres and disciplines are the results the most significant? What in Polish science seems the most interesting?

[Marchuk] The delegation that has come to Poland to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the signing of the cooperation agreement between the USSR and Polish Academies of Sciences includes the presidents of the Academies of Science of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In this way we wanted to express our esteem and recognition of Polish science and its importance, and our respect for our Polish colleagues who have created it. We believe that during these 30 years of our cooperation, we have managed to add to our countries' achievements many valuable developments that have improved and are still improving various spheres of the economy. Three years ago we set down with our Polish colleagues the basic paths of the development of cooperation between our academies. This is an ambitious program closely connected with the needs of both our economies and the social development of our countries. I would like to mention in particular the energetic cooperation of Polish scholars to further the development of such scientific spheres as mathematics, physics, mechanics, cosmic research, and knowledge of materials.

The work of Polish scholars in the social sciences enjoys avid interest in our country. I believe that all in all, we have much to offer each other. There are more and more scientific problems we wish to solve together, pooling the efforts of increasingly larger teams in both countries. At the same time, we are trying to create the best possible material-technological conditions for such cooperation. We remember what Wojciech Jaruzelski told Polish and Soviet scientists several years ago: "You are getting to know each other more and more and are undertaking joint laboratory work with increasing confidence." Since then, our academy has built a hostel in Moscow to house the several hundred Polish scientists and their families who are now working with us in the modern USSR Academy of Sciences laboratories. I believe this is an important fact for us. [passage omitted]

Romania Thanks Presidium, Council for Greetings

PM111645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[Romanian leaders' message thanking Soviet leadership bodies for anniversary congratulations]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

The USSR Council of Ministers

Dear Comrades,

On behalf of the RCP Central Committee, the State Council and Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Romanian people, and also on our own behalf we express cordial gratitude to you, the CPSU Central Committee, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers for the greetings and wishes sent on the 40th anniversary of the Republic's proclamation.

We express confidence that the relations of friendship and all-around cooperation between our parties, countries, and peoples will develop continuously in the interests of both peoples and of the universal cause of socialism, security, progress, and peace on earth in the spirit of the accords and the top-level talks held in Bucharest and Moscow.

We wish you and the Communists and peoples of the Soviet Union great new achievements in implementing the 27th CPSU Congress decisions and in building a socialist society and communism in your country.

Nicolae Ceausescu, RCP Central Committee general secretary and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania

Constantin Dascalescu, prime minister of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society Board Meets

PM121615 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 88 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] A session of the Soviet-Albanian Friendship Society Central Board devoted to the 42d anniversary of Albania's proclamation as a people's republic was held in Moscow 11 January.

West Europe

Ryzhkov Continues Visit to Sweden

Lays Wreath at Palme Tomb

LD121029 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Stockholm January 12 TASS—Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR today laid a wreath to the tomb of prominent statesman and politician of Sweden Olof Palme.

Olof Palme won great respect and recognition in many countries of the world, including the Soviet Union, owing to his activities aimed at consolidating peace and security in the world, eliminating the threat of a world nuclear war and attaining better mutual understanding between peoples.

Addresses Swedish Businessmen

LD121736 Moscow TASS in English 1636 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Stockholm January 12 TASS—The Soviet Union is for widely developing trade and economic relations with the West, and the nascent turn from confrontation to detente as well as the perestroyka policy in the Soviet Union are creating good prerequisite conditions for this, Nikolay Ryzhkov said here today.

Ryzhkov, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was speaking at a meeting with representatives of the Swedish business community.

"For the first time over the 70-year history of our state the press in capitalist countries not only recognizes the peaceful objectives of Soviet foreign policy, but is also giving its due to it.

"There is no need to explain what has been the cause of it. It is the perestroyka policy in the USSR, the new manner of political thinking and, as its manifestation, the Soviet-American Treaty for Eliminating Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, as well as the prospects it opens for the entire international community," the Soviet head of government said.

He [words indistinct] of Soviet-U.S. confrontation had led not only to an abrupt drop-off in bilateral trade, but also to serious difficulties for the USSR in developing economic relations with other Western nations.

Ryzhkov gave this example: The share of industrialized Western countries in Soviet foreign trade over the past seven years has shrunk to 22 percent from 33 percent. It has diminished in the trade of all socialist states as a whole as well.

"This is why when we analyze prospects for international trade and economic contacts, it is essential to be clearly aware that there are two diametrically opposite variants: Either further advances along the path of scaling down confrontation and reducing arms, which will produce a drastically new situation in interelations, or preserved military confrontation and a continued arms race, which will mean unfavorable conditions for increasing trade, which are already well-known to us, dwindling spheres for cooperation, and many lost opportunities," Ryzhkov said.

Speaking about Soviet-Swedish commercial contacts, he linked prospects for developing economic relations stably and on a broad scale with an updating of the Soviet export pattern and with closer ties in industry.

The Soviet prime minister expressed the hope that in the next few years "interesting, mutually beneficial projects can be found, the circle of Soviet organizations and Swedish firms forming partnerships and making cooperative arrangements will grow, and it will be possible to use the Soviet Union's scientific and technological potential more fully".

Ryzhkov pointed by way of an example to cooperation, including collaborative ventures, with firms of Finland, West Germany, France and a number of other countries.

He said in this connection that the economic reform effected in the USSR "is creating a fundamentally new situation". Already, he explained, enterprises granted the right to maintain independent operations in foreign markets accounted for about a quarter of all Soviet foreign trade, including almost 65 percent of the exports of machines and equipment.

As factories received broader rights, "foreign firms are getting opportunities for investments and commercial activities in our country and for direct involvement in production projects," Ryzhkov said. He assured the attenting businessmen that "the rights and property interests of our foreign partners can be guaranteed".

He said that the period of extensive growth in the Soviet economy was now over and a phase of wide-ranging intensification was beginning.

"Both for the nation as a whole and for individual enterprises participation in the international division of labor is becoming a highly important means of raising economic efficiency and cutting expenses".

"This is why the turn to broad interaction and international cooperation is objective in its nature and will be taking place irrespective of how actively firms of capitalist countries will be sharing in it.

"But it is indisputable that the broader and brisker cooperation with Western firms will be, the more opportunities there will emerge for opening the Soviet market and tapping its vast potential as a factor for universal economic growth," the Soviet head of government said.

He added that prerequisites for such cooperation were available even today and this had been stressed in recent Soviet proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev in Murmansk.

Those proposals, Ryzhkov reminded the businessmen, called for developing Arctic resources, including natural wealth in the Kola Peninsula, as one of the priority areas of cooperation.

Speaking of the Kola Peninsula, he said:

"There we have such a blend of a unique mineral base, qualified workforce, dependable power supplies, well-developed infrastructure and, finally, large scientific potential as offers possibilities for diverse and interesting economic combinations, which could undoubtedly

bring benefit to all participants in such international cooperation. Besides, it could help improve the ecological situation in northern Europe."

Reveals Personal Outlook

PM121233 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 27 Dec 87 p 9

[Unattributed dispatch: "He Hates Working With Dishonest People"]

[Text] Moscow—Nikolay Ryzhkov loves literature and philosophy. He tries to read a lot, but his government work leaves him little free time. At work he prefers to surround himself with open and honest people, says the man who after his statements in DAGENS NYHETER last Wednesday [23 December] is accused of telling the Swedish people barefaced lies when he denies that Soviet submarines are operating in Swedish waters.

"I do not like conservative people. I hate working with them. Nor can I work with people who are not honest. Then they cease to be my friends and colleagues."

At the end of a long interview he spoke in detail about himself. He was asked how he would describe his personality. He hesitated for a long time, saying that this was "a difficult question."

Then he began somewhat cautiously. He gave an account of his training as an engineer and his subsequent career as head of an enterprise in Sverdlovsk in the Urals. Suddenly he became more personal, spoke about his curiosity, which "thank God, has lost none of its sharpness," even at the age of 58. He spoke about his wife—she too is an engineer—and his grandchildren and about his long working day. After a little while, he fell silent and sank into his thoughts.

"I have never spoken about myself in as much detail as this before," he said with a little smile.

This is part of the traditional Soviet role of politician as it has been shaped over decades. The personality disappears behind the formal suit.

It was this role in which he was appearing for the greater part of the 90-minute interview. He said that he is looking forward to the forthcoming talks in Stockholm with Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson—talks which began when the Swedish prime minister visited Moscow in April 1986.

Several bilateral issues are expected to be raised during the talks in Stockholm, on the initiative of either the Soviet Union or Sweden.

Ryzhkov himself will, he revealed, again raise the issue of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. Other issues high on the Soviet list of things to discuss are the demarcation line in the Baltic and Swedish-Soviet trade and the possibility of starting so-called joint ventures.

Sweden will raise the continued violation of its borders by foreign submarines. During the interview with DAGENS NYHETER, Ryzhkov showed that he is well-informed about recent developments on this issue and he repulsed, with some irritation, the suspicions leveled against the Soviet Union that it is behind the violations.

In the DAGENS NYHETER interview, which is published on this page, Ryzhkov gave the Soviet view of many questions. He also spoke in detail about internal developments in the Soviet Union under the "perestroyka" of Gorbachev's reform policy and also touched on current problems in international politics.

He seemed happy to dwell on these questions and to do so in detail, both during the verbal part of the interview and in the written answers to questions delivered in advance. When he finally unbuttoned his politician's suit somewhat, he revealed sides of himself previously unknown to anyone outside his closest circle.

When he was young, he said, he felt it a duty to study. He engaged in evening study alongside his his work, but his study had a goal.

"Now I see everything differently," he said.

Reading, he seemed to want to say, is a way of staying young, of keeping one's curiosity alive, of not stagnating.

His interests have also shifted from one area to another over the years.

"I have undergone a development from technology to economics," he said, alluding to the young engineer's and technician's transformation into an economist and head of Uralmash, the giant machine-building enterprise in Sverdlovsk. "In the last 10-15 years, I have devoted myself mostly to general economic questions. Most recently I have become interested in the world economy."

This has a lot to do with his work as prime minister. But he said that it is also a question of a genuine interest on his part.

Nikolay Ryzhkov has shared many of his interests with his wife, Lyudmila. By profession she is, he said, an "engineer-builder," and they met and for a long time worked together at the same factory. They often discuss social issues, even though there are of course "internal party issues about which I cannot talk to her."

In the new Soviet fashion, launched by Mikhail Gorbachev and his Raisa, she is accompanying him on his visit to Sweden.

Has Ryzhkov, who said that he loves literature, read anything by this year's Nobel prizewinner, Russian exile Joseph Brodsky? His secretary, who was noting the interview at a desk next to the enormous boardroom table, lifted her head and smiled at the question. Her boss said that he had not read much by the Nobel prizewinner but had heard that a Soviet periodical would be publishing some of Brodsky's poems for the first time.

"He himself said that there are perhaps poets who better deserve the prize. It sounds as if he is a modest person," Ryzhkov said diplomatically.

Signs Agreements

LD131103 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 13 Jan 88

[Text] The visit to Sweden by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, is continuing. Today in Stockholm the signing of a number of Soviet-Swedish documents—intergovernmental agreements on the principles of maritime demarcation in the Baltic Sea, on the prompt notification of nuclear accidents, and on the exchange of information on nuclear installations—took place.

These agreements were signed by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, and Ingvar Carlsson, the Swedish prime minister.

Service Record of Britain's Thatcher Marked

PM081030 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 88 p 3

[Own correspondent Yu. Sagaydak report: "3,170 Days Inside Politics"]

[Excerpts] London—Today is Margaret Thatcher's 3,170th day in power in Britain. She has broken the record for this century, set at the beginning of the century by British Prime Minister Asquith. How did the first woman prime minister in British history manage to achieve such success, especially since M. Thatcher found herself in entirely different conditions from the previous "record holder"? [passage omitted]

The British prime minister gets up at 6 am. She reads the FINANCIAL TIMES, and then it is hard work until late in the evening. She has no time for hobbies or friends, no interests outside politics, the omnipresent, omniscient British press emphasizes.

While the British leader's capacity for work arouses nothing but admiration, even among her political opponents, her style of leadership is sometimes subjected to blunt criticism. While in government she has replaced so many heads of various departments that they could form a "cabinet in exile." Suffice it to say that only five of the present members of the government, including M. Thatcher herself, started in 1979.

Today in Britain you can often hear people say how hard it is for male ministers to work with a woman head of cabinet. Those who have lost their ministerial portfolios also complain about this. But there is also another view directly opposed to this. Like any woman, M. Thatcher loves compliments, of course, but on essential matters avoids sympathies and antipathies. "She treats her ministers much more evenly than a male prime minister could do," Norman Tebbit, former chairman of the Conservative Party, believes. So what makes members of the stronger sex nervous when they deal with M. Thatcher? First and foremost, say people in the know, the present British leader does not tolerate incompetence. She allows 4 minutes for a report, and from the questions she asks, the impression is created that she knows the subject in more depth than the person presenting the report.

What has the prime minister done for the country in nearly 9 years in power? "My policy is not based on some kind of economic theory but on common sense, which millions of other people have apart from me," M. Thatcher claims. In her years in government, she has managed to undermine the influence of the trade unions. The result is clear: The number of strikes in the country has been reduced several times over. The boosting of the policy of monetarism and the free market has meant that the number of shareholders in the country has trebled. There are more home owners, and wages have increased for those who have jobs. But what about those who do not have jobs? Unemployment benefit is today paid to nearly 3 million Britons, an unprecedented figure for a country with a population of fewer than 60 million. A vast number of homeless people are forced to take shelter in lodgings, and sometimes in the notorious "cardboard camps," many of which have grown up in London alone. There has been an unprecedented increase in crime, and the health and education systems are in a neglected and, basically, critical state. The list of social evils in Britain today could clearly be continued indefinitely. Whereas the most highly paid 10% of employees last year increased their incomes by nearly 50%, the 10% at the other extreme increased theirs by only 1%. The country is divided into the prosperous south and the poor north, where it is impossible to find work.

Such social contrasts determine the Britons' attitude to the present cabinet, which is often associated with the prime minister personally. There is probably nobody in this country who is indifferent to Margaret Thatcher. Reactions range from ovations and declarations of admiration and love to irritation and unconcealed hostility. What are the personal and political qualities that enable M. Thatcher to stay afloat in this sea of turbulent passions, and not merely to keep afloat, but to lead

Britain confidently? Many people agree that they are determination, self-confidence, and a tremendous capacity for work. For my part, I would add exceptional abilities as an orator.

Incidentally, M. Thatcher's role in international relations should be spoken of separately. Not so long ago our press, radio, and television used to call her the "Iron Lady." Today that term is forgotten, or almost forgotten. What has changed? Has M. Thatcher changed, her philsophy, her hostility to us, to the Soviet people? Hardly! All that have changed are the rules of the game in the international arena, rules which M. Thatcher, as a subtle and experienced politician, has studied and mastered. The restructuring in the USSR, the Soviet peace offensive, have acted as a powerful magnet, attracting Britons' attention to the Land of the Soviets. So last spring, on her preelection tour, M. Thatcher set off not for Washington but for Moscow. Moreover she seeks to play an ever more prominent role in the new international processes, realizing that without an active, constructive "Ostpolitik" you cannot, today, lay claim to the role of Western leader. The times of anti-Soviet obscurantism are long past. It was that understanding of the modern world that prompted M. Thatcher to make a statement that relations between the USSR and Britain are now better than at any time since World War II. Time will tell whether this is more a matter of playing the political game or of real support for the ideas of the new political thinking. But the fact remains: Our bilateral relations are on an upswing; they have become an important component of the process of nuclear disarmament, the strengthening of mutual trust, and the thawing of the international climate as a whole.

Today the British press is eagerly asking whether M. Thatcher will be able to set an absolute record for the length of stay in 10 Downing Street, the official residence of British prime ministers. To take top place in that table of rank, she must remain in power for nearly 14 years more. No easy task, you will agree.

Thatcher Visit to Kenya, Nigeria Viewed

PM111545 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jan 88 Second Edition p 5

[Political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov article: "Viewpoint; London and Africa"]

[Text] The British prime minister's trip to Kenya and Nigeria had particularly major repercussions in the countries of the Commonwealth, which unites former British possessions around the world. The fact is that at the recent Vancouver conference of Commonwealth countries' heads of state and government, as at previous such meetings, M. Thatcher was the only opponent of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. This is why, in the words of REUTER, she has the reputation in black Africa as the defender of Pretoria's racist regime.

The visits by the head of the British Government to Kenya and Nigeria are depicted by London as a conciliatory gesture toward the Africans, designed to neutralize Vancouver's negative aftereffect. The main stress now, they say, is on bilateral relations with Britain's important trading partners (although its trade with South Africa—2.5 billion dollars—significantly exceeds total commodity turnover with Kenya and Nigeria), and on British aid to the Commonwealth countries (Kenya is its largest recipient after India). But the tension in the atmosphere can be judged if only by the fact that press conferences have been entirely excluded from the program of the visits. The public of the Dark Continent reacted no less stormily, perhaps, to M. Thatcher's statements characterizing the African National Congress [ANC] as a "terrorist organization," than to the refusal, confirmed during the trip, to join in the sanctions against South Africa.

Here it is appropriate to remember 1979 when the first lady, who had just settled into Downing Street, had to set off for Africa to a Commonwealth countries' conference in the capital of Zambia—Lusaka. At that time, war was raging in neighboring Rhodesia. A quarter of a million whites usurped power there, not wishing to share it with 7 million dark-skinned Africans. Deprived of their political rights, the majority rebelled against the racist regime. By the end of the seventies, the national liberation movement (it was called "terrorist" in London) was close to victory.

And then, after M. Thatcher's visit to Lusaka, the British Government decided to take the role of mediator in order to settle the conflict by political means. The conference took place in London in Lancaster House, putting an end to the 7-year armed struggle in Rhodesia. Elections were held there for the first time on the principle of "one man, one vote." The Republic of Zimbabwe was proclaimed, setting an example of peaceful coexistence among different races. After the Africans came to power, there was no bloodbath. The black majority received their political rights. The white minority also benefited from the peace and stability that proceeded to reign. When the first fears had passed, a third of white families who had hastened to leave Zimbabwe came back. The deterioration of the situation in South Africa, to which the majority of former Rhodesians had headed at first, also helped in this.

Can Zimbabwe's experience in some way serve as an example for a settlement of the crisis in South Africa? In my opinion, there are several arguments in favor of this, to which I would like to add London's probable interest in avoiding a violent solution. The conviction that apartheid has become obsolete both politically and economically is growing not only among the liberal intelligentsia but also in business circles. Skilled workers are needed for modern production. For this it is essential to give young African people access to education. The number of opponents of apartheid is growing, thanks also to the reasonable policy of the ANC. In every

possible way,it stresses that it is conducting a struggle not against whites but against racial inequality, and that South Africa should belong to everyone who lives there.

In short, historical experience suggests that characterizing the ANC as a "terrorist organization" is as mistaken as it is shortsighted. If the flexibility and willingness to compromise—for which British politicians were once famous—are still characteristic of them today, is it not time to think that the principle of national reconciliation, which in its time led to success in Zimbabwe, and is now being applied in Afghanistan, Cambodia and Nicaragua, could also put an end to the hotbed of tension in South Africa? If London were to once again use the leverage it possesses for mediation, this would raise its prestige not only in the Dark Continent but also throughout the world.

More on Visit to Nigeria

LD091715 Moscow TASS in English 1351 GMT 9 Jan 88

[Text] Lagos January 9 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's visit to Nigeria ended without any final documents signed. The visit was made against the background of mass protests by the country's public against the British policy in the south of Africa, the policy which is viewed as a direct assistance to South Africa's racists.

Mrs Thatcher admitted that London and Lagos adhered to different positions on the problems of South Africa. She again stated that she opposed the application of comprehensive mandatory sanctions (which the democratic forces of South Africa insist upon) against South Africa. In so doing the British prime minister argued that sanctions would ostensibly only aggravate the suffering of Africans in the Republic of South Africa and would not help to end apartheid.

Nigerian President Ibrahim Babangida urged Britain to reconsider its approach to the problems of South Africa in the conditions of unceasing violence there.

He said the cruelty of the racist regime, the acts of destabilization and aggression against neighbouring countries, and repressive actions against African population aroused a deep concern of Nigeria and other countries which respect human dignity, freedom and equality.

Speaking at the banquet given in her honour on Thursday, Mrs Thatcher welcomed the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty. She said the document was the best new-year present to mankind and that its signing had become possible as a result of calm consideration, patient work, and persisitent negotiations. Mr Babangida referred to the Washington summit as a historic step in the cause of easing international tensions.

Nigeria was the second African country which Margaret Thatcher visited this week. Earlier, she had talks in Kenya during which she had likewise ruled out the possibility of application of sanctions against the Pretoria regime by London.

The African press has pointed out that, judging by the prime minister's pronouncements, she does not intend to change her policy in the South of Africa in any way.

Handling of UK, USSR Nuclear Incidents Contrasted

PM081605 [Editorial report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 January 1988 in its Second Edition carries on page 5 under the headline "Lessons Obligatory for All" a reprint of a 700-word editorial entitled "Windscale Fires Burn On" from the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN (carried in the 2 January issue). The editorial deals with the UK Government's recent revelation of the real gravity of the 1957 fire at Britain's Windscale nuclear power station and the extent to which it was covered up at the time of the accident. It ponders the thought that "it may well be Soviet frankness over Chernobyl which forced the British Government" to reveal some of the facts behind the official cover-up.

The reprinted editorial is followed by Arkadiy Maslennikov's "Observer's Opinion":

"The editorial reprinted from the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN speaks quite eloquently of those very far from noble motives which led the official British authorities to hush up the true scale of the disaster at Sellafield [new name for Windscale] and its effect on people's health.

"I can add for my part that, while PRAVDA's correspondent in Britain, I have not only observed but also participated personally in numerous debates during which representatives of the British authorities and the mass media have attempted to accuse the Soviet Union of covering up the true scale of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. At that time, the British press was carrying almost daily reports from the Ministry of Agriculture on how many head of sheep 'had to be written off,' and which rivers and lakes in Scotland or North Wales increased radiation had been detected in.

"At that very same time, British newspapers, not to mention Whitehall spokesmen, were very reluctant to mention Sellafield, which had been continuing to contaminate the surrounding British territory and the adjacent waters of the Irish Sea with radioactive effluent. Nor was space found in the British press for a statement by a London physician who reported at the time that the strontium content in his patients' tonsils had increased tenfold after the Sellafield tragedy.

"Attempts to play to the gallery and make dubious political capital out of the Chernobyl accident sometimes assumed truly grotesque forms. Thus, during an

unofficial reception at 10 Downing Street for Leonid Telyatnikov, the Chernobyl firemen's leader who had come to London at the invitation of his British colleagues, Prime Minister Thatcher deemed it possible to declare that the British know about Chernobyl not only because of the heroic deeds of those who fought the fire but also because of the dead domestic animals and the poisoned rivers and lakes on the territory of England, Scotland, and Wales. To the guest's honor, he found a worthy reply: 'You know, Madam,' he said, 'that we paid for that tragedy with the lives of our comrades and did everything to ensure that people in other countries would not die.'

"Of course, the peoples have a right to demand to be informed—immediately and to the fullest extent—about tragedies such as Chernobyl or Sellafield. They have a right to know the whole truth, so as to have an opportunity to pool their efforts in the struggle to prevent such accidents or, if they have, unfortunately, already happened, to eliminate their consequences. This is the lesson Soviet people have drawn from the events at Chernobyl, and the tragedy at Sellafield teaches the same thing."

Vorontsov Meets FRG, Greek Envoys Envoys
LD121813 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Yuliy Vorontsov today received ambassadors of the Federal Republic of Germany and Denmark Andreas Meyer-Landrut and Rudolph Anton Thorning-Petersen and Charge d'Affaires ad Interim of the Republic of Greece A. Sandis at their request.

The conversation focused on some aspects of the situation around Afghanistan. From the Soviet side, the hope was expressed that the countries, members of the European Community, represented by the three diplomats in this case, could contribute constructively to the creation of a favourable atmosphere conducive to the earliest settlement of the Afghan problem.

FRG Warships To Relieve Gulf-Bound U.S. Ships
PM071311 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jan 88 p 4

[Own correspondents V. Neznamov and Ye. Bovkun dispatches under general rubric "Forestalling Events" and the headline "The Bundesmarine Ships' Assignment"]

[Text] Algiers—Own correspondent V. Neznamov reports: A detachment consisting of five ships of the West German Navy is preparing to take up alert duty in the Mediterranean.

The ships are to leave FRG ports on 21 January in order to "stand in" for a number of weeks for some U.S. 6th Fleet ships deployed here, which are leaving for the Persian Gulf in order to escort U.S.-flagged tankers there. [Neznamov ends].

We have asked Ye. Bovkun, IZVESTIYA correspondent in Bonn, to throw some light on this decision. Here is his report:

FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner has declined similar Pentagon demands in the past. What made him change the decision? I addressed this question to the Bonn Defense Ministry.

"This is connected with the situation in the Persian Gulf," a ministry spokesman explained. "A new situation has developed. There has never been such a concentration of NATO naval forces anywhere. There are not only Americans there, but also the British, Italians, Dutch, Belgians, and the French. Since we, guided by the provisions of our constitution, continue to rule out the dispatch of Bundesmarine ships to the Persian Gulf, that is to say, beyond the confines of NATO's sphere of action, we have had to give some thought to whether we could not in some way 'relieve the pressure' on our allies in the bloc...."

And so the Bundesmarine is acquiring new additional functions within NATO, as it were. In this context the debate on the role of the FRG Navy has been revived in Bonn.

Let me recall, that the debate about operations "outside the Atlantic Alliance's zone" took place in NATO after the seizure of the U.S. hostages in Tehran in 1979 and U.S. attempts to launch a military operation against Iran in early 1980.

Certain Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union politicians favored the dispatch of Bundesmarine ships to the Middle East at that time. However, the call to revert to the bankrupt "gunboat policy" did not find support either among the public or the broad military circles in the FRG.

Meanwhile the United States embarked essentially on translating into reality the principle of "the expansion of the radius of action" of the allies. Contrary to the section of the 1949 treaty on the establishment of NATO, which states that the "radius of action" is confined to the territory of member countries and the the Atlantic Ocean north of the tropic of Cancer, NATO leaders have begun to claim that the bloc must have no borders. Admiral H. Train stated bluntly that the Atlantic Alliance is called upon to exercise control over all strategically important zones of the world's oceans. Now a major multinational contingent of NATO naval forces is being formed in the Persian Gulf for the first time.

The Federal Republic will not take part in it but, as mentioned before, it has decided to stand in for allied ships in the Mediterranean. The very principle of "standing in" is fraught with danger. By means of this principle, the United States may try to sidestep constitutional restrictions that apply to the Armed Forces in the FRG.

French Communist Central Committee Plenum Opens
LD061228 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 6 Jan 88

[Text] Paris January 6 TASS—A plenary meeting of the French Communist Party [PCF] Central Committee which opened here today is devoted to the Communists' preparations for the presidential elections to take place in France this spring. Pierre Blotin, member of the French Communist Party Political Bureau, delivered a report in this issue at the plenum.

Negotiations on U.S. Bases in Greece Begin
LD111425 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 11 Jan 88

[[Text] Athens January 11 TASS—The second round of the Greek-American negotiations on the future of the U.S. military bases in Greece began in Athens today. The Greek delegation is led by the Greek permanent representative at the NATO Council Khristos Zaharakis, the U.S. delegation—representative of the Department of State Alan Flanigan.

The first round of negotiations, held in November last year, has been to no avail.

The term of the agreement on the stay on Greece's territory of 4 big bases and 20 smaller military structures of the Pentagon is due to expire late this year. Washington stubbornly seeks preservation of its bases in Greece, considering them as an important springboard in the NATO's southern flank. The Greek Government's position is that if the two sides reach an agreement, acceptable to Greece from the viewpoint of national interests, it will be submitted for a national referendum. If no agreement is reached, then the previous Greek-American agreement stays in force, and the United States will have to withdraw its bases from Greece within 17 months from December 31 this year.

The current round of negotiations is to end on Friday. But the press says, the discussion of the question of bases is expected to be long.

Italian Communist Natta Greeted on Birthday
PM081411 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 88 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev congratulations to Italian Communist Party Secretary General A. Natta on 70th birthday]

[Text] To Comrade Alessandro Natta, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party

Dear Comrade Alessandro Natta!

I cordially congratulate you on your 70th birthday.

Soviet Communists know of the struggle for democracy and social progress, for peace and disarmament which you are waging in the post of secretary general of the Italian Communist Party.

Mankind has no loftier task today than to ensure world peace and preserve world civilization. Our planet's secure, nuclear-free future depends on the activities of communists and other peace-loving forces. The friendship and cooperation between Soviet and Italian Communists and between the Soviet and Italian peoples are of great significance in the struggle for these goals.

I wish you, Dear Comrade Natta, good health and great successes in your activity.

M. Gorbachev.

Civil Aviation Minister Meets Alitalia President
LD111829 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 11 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 11 TASS—Soviet Civil Aviation Minister Alexandr Volkov today received the president of Alitalia, Umberto Nordio.

The head of the Italian air company was invited by the Soviet ministry.

The sides discussed issues of the further extension of cooperation between Aeroflot and Alitalia.

An additional protocol has been signed to an agreement on air links between the USSR and Italy, envisaging a greater number of flights between the two countries and along the trans-Siberian route between Rome and Tokyo.

Italy's Spadolini Comments on Soviet-U.S. Summit
LD091732 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 9 Jan 88

[Text] Rome January 9 TASS—TASS correspondent Nikolay Teterin reports:

"The Soviet-American summit meeting in Washington was a turning point in international relations whose significance goes far beyond the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles because it affects the global prospects of the East-West relations", Giovanni Spadolini, chairman of the Senate of Italian Parliament, has said in a TASS interview.

"It is too early to speak about the elimination of nuclear weapons in general. However, the first step in the right direction has been made. It is obvious that a new stage is being started under the theme of detente which should be based on clear and verifiable agreements.

"A turn in the East-West relations is the result of joint efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States. On the one hand, President Reagan wanted to mark in a positive way the last year of his stay in office. On the other hand, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, realized one of the most important aspects of his political vision that binds the process of transformation of Soviet society and a new security concept.

"Now it is necessary to reach new targets on the way to disarmament without forgetting for a moment that peaceful coexistence between the alliances based on such different political and social systems requires the observance of a parity of military might in the sphere of conventional weapons too. It would be logical to hope that the historic beginning of nuclear detente could make a positive impact both on the settlement of the situation in the Persian Gulf region and on the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East in which the Soviet Union should take part by all means. And, finally, this development of events again raises the problem of the need for concluding an international agreement on the eradication of terrorism, also with the participation of the USSR and the United States", Spadoloni said.

Portuguese Communist Hails INF Treaty, Reform

PM121349 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 88 First Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Volkov dispatch: "A. Cunhal's Opinion"]

[Text] Lisbon, 6 Jan—The process of restructuring Soviet society is picking up speed, and socialism is gathering strength thanks to its successes, A. Cunhal, general secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party [PCP], stated in conversation with journalists on his return from Moscow. During my meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, I received detailed information about the changes under way in the USSR, he said.

In addition, the PCP leader stated, we exchanged opinions on the question of the struggle for peace, the defense of which, both parties think, is the main task for mankind. As is well-known, Portuguese Communists rate highly the Soviet peace policy and approve the CPSU's initiatives in this direction. The PCP thinks that the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed by Gorbachev and Reagan constitutes a most important step in the disarmament process and in the process of relaxing international relations. The struggle for peace is a matter for all mankind, and there must be no room in it for social and ideological borders, A. Cunhal pointed out.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Address to Media Chiefs' Meeting

PM131225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jan 88 Second Edition pp 1-3

[TASS headline: "Democratization— The Essence of Restructuring, the Essence of Socialism. Meeting in the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] It has already been reported that a meeting with top executives of mass media bodies, ideological institutions and creative workers' unions was held at the CPSU Central Committee on January 8.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the meeting.

He said:

Comrades, we are meeting at the very start of the new year. But our discussion will concern not only this, but also the previous year. This is not because precisely in this way, in this light problems are considered at the border of two years, but because the past year and the year that has begun already are closely interconnected.

We want to talk today in the spirit of meetings that we have already had: in a comradely and frank way. The current time determines the future of our country, and we are to check our clocks again. That is why we are conducting such discussions, above all, within the party, with the party apparatus, with all sections of our population.

Naturally, we want to continue the good tradition that we have established—meetings with top executives of mass media bodies and unions of creative workers.

We badly need exchanges of views and thoughts and comradely discussion. That is why we are attaching much importance to meetings with you, dear comrades.

I said that we are meeting on the border of 1987-1988. This alone creates conditions for assessing the past, what has been accomplished, and for trying to look into the future.

Another circumstance makes the discussion especially significant. We have completed on the whole the first stage of restructuring; a second stage is beginning. We are, therefore, at the threshold. Of course, this division into stages is symbolic.

In life, everything is inter-related. Much of what has started is continuing and will continue.

We distinguish between these two stages in order to see more clearly what tasks are facing us. At the first stage, we had to work thoroughly to produce a theoretical analysis of the situation that had been established by the mid-eighties.

Now it is necessary to analyze the real state of society in which we live and make plans for the future—and that not on the basis of superficial and simplistic notions, but with awareness of responsibility before the country, before socialism and before the world, taking into account the weight and role of our country.

We have worked out a concept of perestroyka, or restructuring, and adopted most important, major decisions. Without these decisions, we would be unable to act on a long-term basis while handling simultaneously current issues.

Many forces of our society had been activated at that stage of restructuring—above all, the potential of the party, scientists, artistic intellectuals and mass media. The country was alive, the people were active. They were working, coping with tasks without waiting for the completion of theoretical and political studies.

The first stage differs from the next one precisely in that—we have found out what has to be done and in what way. This is a hard task, it remains topical today. But now the most complex stage has begun, when the concept of perestroyka should come into broad contact with life, with the practical activity of millions of Soviet people.

What has been realized by the political leadership and the foremost part of our people must be now realized by the entire Soviet people, by all its strata. Without it, without the clear understanding of the party's policy there will be no firm belief in the need for it. It is this belief that determines the spirit of the people and their real deeds.

This task is indeed a daunting one. Man remains in the center here, both from the point of view that everything is made by man and from the point of view that people themselves must do all that we have conceived collectively.

Many things came to a head now and discussions are mounting. The process of perestroyka is not without struggle. This is natural. If perestroyka is indeed the continuation of the revolution, if we are currently pursuing a truly revolutionary policy, then the struggle is inevitable.

This was the case in the years of all revolutions; it will be so now. We feel this. Quite another matter is the forms of the struggle and the forces involved. In our country they are not antagonistic, warring sides with opposing class

interests. One can rather speak about the time-serving interests of groups and sometimes even ambitions, if the latter can be regarded as interests at all.

We are all involved in the great creative effort to restructure the country. Therefore, the nature of the struggle will have the form of discussions and ideological disputes, aimed at taking a better look at the situation and making the tasks confronting us clear. This should be in the focus of attention, comrades.

We are emerging from one stage and entering another. The tasks and, especially the scale of work, undergo a qualitative change. The centre of gravity is already being shifted into the plane of practical realization, the plane of translating the policy into reality. This is a qualitatively new situation. We have all felt it.

All those who are taking part in this meeting are connected in the most direct way with the life of our society, receive every day extensive information, understand, see and feel the processes under way in the country, and their prospects.

In this sense, I would like to stress once more that year 1987 has given us a lot. Evaluating it even by the most stringent yardsticks, we must admit that it was the year of great work. Indeed, if there was no theoretical, political and practical work, which we have carried out last year in connection with the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, we would have been now two to three steps lower in our understanding of the past and the present stage, as well as our prospects. We have extended the analysis of society. We now have a better knowledge of our history. This has an exceptionally important significance.

One cannot agree with those who suggest that we forget history or use only a certain part of it. We understand full well now that such a point of view is unacceptable. We must have profound knowledge of our country's history, especially in the post-revolutionary period. The knowledge of history, the knowledge of the causes of these or other phenomena, of the causes which underline the main achievements of our state and the knowledge of the causes of major mistakes and the tragic events in our history - all this allows us to draw a lesson today as we seek to rejuvenate society and to tap more fully the potential of socialism and its assets. Indeed, we now have a better knowledge of our history and of the root causes behind many phenomena which gave us all a cause for anxiety in recent years and were the main cause of the decision on the need for social restructuring.

Revolution is not something carved in stone, not something given once and for all times. It will be extended and developed in the course of further research.

Deepening knowledge, understanding history, drawing lessons from the past and working out the future path of advancement—this is what describes our work today. What has been done in that area has enriched the entire political, ideological and spiritual sphere of society's life. That's number one.

Secondly, as I have already mentioned, the year 1987 was a year of major decisions. I would say this: Should we not have decisions of the January and June plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee, should we not have the Law on the State Enterprise, we would be different. Our understanding of the situation and our notion of what is to be done now and in what ways to advance further would be different.

Substantial advancement in elaborating the theory and policy of perestroyka imparts a conscious, purposeful character to our work. We can now act consistently, proceeding from decisions adopted, on the basis of scientific analysis and broad discussion of these problems in the party, in society on the whole. This is what makes it possible to move on to the next stage of restructuring.

The past year convincingly showed that processes taking place in the Soviet Union are of immense significance not only for our country and our people, but also for the destinies of socialism, for the world situation as a whole. We felt that particularly keenly in the past year.

This determines also the measure of our responsibility. What we are doing inside the country, in combination with initiatives in the sphere of foreign policy, enabled us to feel for the first time that it is possible to raise real tasks on changing the world situation for the better.

Let us recall: Not long ago, on January 15, 1986, we proclaimed the concept of a nuclear-free, safe world. The first reaction in the West (especially among politicians, political scientists) was such—it's a utopia.

From the very beginning we conceived and prepared the document in a way so that it would not be taken for another clamorous slogan, probably with a greater tint of pacifism, but detached from realistic policy.

No, it clearly defines objectives, specific approaches to handling tasks and the balance of interests. We were sure that this document would work. Nevertheless, many believed at the initial stage that it only defined a remote goal with no present-day significance.

Today we see how ideas which we have advanced and describe as new political thinking are breaking through—with difficulties, with struggle, by overcoming existing stereotypes and old approaches, but breaking through.

You all maintain extensive contacts with various representatives of world public opinion. I think you will confirm that there is no exaggeration in my statement.

The situation, the sentiments in the world are changing for the better. The past year showed convincingly that much weariness, many problems that complicate human life accumulated in the world. The arms race, military confrontation divert immense resources, human minds and human forces away from the solution of vitally important universal tasks.

That is why our concept followed by specific initiatives lay on the prepared soil. First sprouts have already emerged. I think we can describe the concrete result in the following way: A real process of improving the international situation has set in. No breakthrough has yet taken place, but the beginning was made by the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

From the political viewpoint, considering the past year in a broad aspect, we assess it as a year of large-scale, principal events and changes in world development.

The most important thing, from the view of the political assessment of the course of perestroyka, one should point out, is that people are beginning to play the key part in its chief areas. They are making themselves seen to an increasing extent taking advantage of processes of democratization and openness in the work of party and state bodies and public organizations.

Look at the thorough way in which the working class is raising issues of society's life and perestroyka, how realistic it is in advancing its demands stemming from the new situation.

On December, 31, we in the Politburo spent several hours discussing the most signal events of the past year. One of our conclusions is that it is probably only some individuals or small groups of people who stood on the anti-perestroyka positions last year. On the whole, workers, farmers and intellectuals acted in the most keen debates, in the strongest clashes of views and discussions of various issues of life in branches, in work collectives with a sense of immense responsibility for the cause of perestroyka, for the country, for socialism.

This, comrades, is a very important phenomenon. It's good that we have ceased to fear, ceased to flounder in perplexity at the slightest movement of thought within the people, their attempts to materialize the potential of socialist democracy intrinsic in our system. The party is accumulating experience, the cadres are accumulating experience. That is not an easy process. It is not without pain: we still often scare one another.

We are frequently criticized by some from the right, some from the left. The latter say that restructuring has stopped, and call for more resolute measures, for personnel reshuffles and so on. This was manifested, specifically, at the October plenum of the Central Committee.

What did the discussion show? Now that we started serious work, implementation of the policy of perestroyka, its translation into life, the "ultra-perestroyka" phraseology proved to be helpless. Representatives of the "revolutionary" phrase have neither composure, nor readiness to assume responsibility, the onus of stubborn and lengthy work in order to move our society to new frontiers.

We shall not conceal the fact that the party's rebuff to this phraseology was viewed by some intellectuals, especially young people, as a blow to perestroyka. This is the greatest delusion, and the people understood that correctly, without yielding to demagogic phrases.

Now about criticism of perestroyka from the right. Voices from that side claim that the "foundations of socialism" are being undermined. A legitimate question arises: By what are they being undermined? By the fact that people are flexing their muscles and raising their heads so as to handle more confidently the affairs in the country where they are the masters? On the contrary, socialism is not weakening. It is gaining strength and, through the people's political and social activity, is materializing more fully its potential.

A blow is being dealt at command-and-administer methods and those who carry them out, at their interests; at those who fail to understand the times and realize that we cannot move on other than through democratization of our life. But precisely that had been conceived when we embarked on restructuring. That is why we should firmly follow the path chosen. In this sense, the year 1987 was a great school of socialist democracy.

The lessons are, of course, hard to learn, but, I would tell you, they are absorbed well. We are no longer what we had been in April 1985, and not even what we had been before 1987. We have acquired much. Some might say: We have lost something. We haven't yet lost anything of importance, and I think, we will not lose that if we stick to the principled line.

What tasks remain the most difficult today, where are the pitfalls of restructuring? I would say that: It would be unrealistic to believe that we have already broken the deceleration mechanism, that we have completely switched to the tracks of broad socialist democracy, to the tracks of the new economic mechanism. We are just starting perestroyka, our society is just leaving the period of stagnation. The task of breaking the deceleration mechanism which hinders the process of restructuring remains principal today.

The establishment of a new ideological and moral atmosphere, characterized by broad openness, criticism and self-criticism, the deepening process of democratization and growth of the working people's responsibility for the state of affairs in the country was a great accomplishment of the first stage of perestroyka. All that calls for consolidation and development. The main political

result is the people's growing support for the party's course towards perestroyka. A process of consolidation of society around ideas of perestroyka is under way. And that is not merely at the level of meetings and slogans, but also in actual work, in essence.

On the whole, we chose at the January plenum of the party Central Committee a correct course, the course towards developing socialist democracy. Through democratization, through people's involvement in all processes of society, it is possible to carry out perestroyka, to make it irreversible. I would add at this point that democratization, openness are not merely means of restructuring.

This is the exercise of the essence of our socialist system, a system of the working people and for the working people. This is not a short-lived campaign, but the essence of socialism—what distinguishes it from bourgeois democracy which creates through artful designs only a semblance of freedom and openness, pushing the people away from real political power, giving them only one opportunity, as Lenin put it, that of deciding during election campaigns who will fool them for the next term.

We want to involve people through socialist democracy in all processes of management. And when we are being pulled towards bourgeois liberalism and its 'values', this is a backward movement.

We have made our choice, and we will follow the path started in 1917. We are seriously tackling the task of releasing the entire potential of our system, of socialist democracy. This is Lenin's idea: The proletariat is getting ready for socialism through democracy and can govern society following the revolution only through broadening democracy.

Let us recall once again with gratitude the January plenum: It brought home to us the understanding of the need for broad democratization of our society. This means that it was not in vain that we had worked jointly to prepare it. Everything that is contained in its decisions and documents is also the party's collective experience and the realization of thoughts and proposals put forward by the scientific and artistic communities, all sections of society.

Another important lesson of the past year that is to be learnt is as follows. We subscribe to Lenin's concept of political party. According to Lenin, it is a party of a new type performing the part of political vanguard of society. The entire preceding history of the country, with all acquisitions and losses, showed that this is precisely so.

We come to realize ever clearer today that no transformations are possible without a political vanguard capable of rallying the best forces of the country ideologically and organizationally, of comprehending the processes taking place in society and realising the results of this scientific analysis, that is without the Communist Party.

But the party must not lag behind the processes taking place in society. We have learned this in many respects last year. Wherever we lagged, there appeared many things that later evoked concern in society. We are learning the lessons from this and we draw conclusions, not only at the level of political leadership and government, but also in republics, regions, work collectives. This is very important, though we cannot say yet that all party organizations act in this way.

What else can be said about the lessons of perestroyka? We, perhaps, have not been realising completely how widespread various negative phenomena—parasitic attitudes, levelling of pay, report padding, parochialism, departmentalism, illegal actions—became in the years of stagnation. We are waging and shall be waging resolutely and consistently the struggle for the improvement, for cutting short criminal activity, and ridding society of persons with deformed morality. But we underestimated the scope of other negative phenomena that gripped our society.

Take the levelling of pay, parasitic attitudes. Things went so far that requests are sent to the center—the Central Committee and government—wherever anything necessary for daily living—building materials, coal or other things—are lacking anywhere. In a country with a population of nearly 300 million and large managerial apparatus in localities, decisions on many, even the simplest matters, have to be taken here, in Moscow. Such are the fruits of stagnation, of unjustifiable centralization, that we reap now.

There is another aspect. Our notion of social justice has been deformed in a certain measure. This was manifested also in the writings in the press. If views that have gained support in some bodies of our press were to be realized, there would be a need for ironing out entire society, and reducing everyone to the same level: a talented person and a mediocrity, a diligent worker and a shirker, an honorable man and a thief. Deplorably, a widely current attitude is that one can work ten times less, a hundred times less than others, can do nothing at all and at the same time enjoy all the benefits in the same degree as people who by their work make a large contribution to the country's development.

Our satirists aptly summed up this situation: "I want to live in a good flat, I wish that there should be no queues, that there should be no crush, that I could emerge from a bus ride with all my buttons intact, I want to have all my wishes fulfilled. The only thing that I do not want is to do something for this."

We are right in criticizing our cadres, our leading bodies. This criticism should be continued and its acuteness should not be lowered. But many problems have accumulated also in work collectives. Our entire society should be made to realize our socialist values more profoundly.

If report padding, levelling of pay, consumerism and parasitic attitudes persist, there will be no progress in perestroyka either in industry or in other areas.

We must live and act proceeding from the principle of socialism: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work". There is a high degree of social protection in our country. This is what distinguishes socialism. We have free education, free medical services, the right to work, the guarantee of getting a job, housing available at a moderate rent, though it is still an acute problem. Socialism protects everyone, but what kind of contribution does society receive from everyone? This is what much thought should be given to. It was recently reported in the press that in some collective farms, milkmaids were earning R600 per month, while getting yearly only 2,000 kilograms of milk per cow. When it was attempted to introduce the pay according to work, they assessed this as a blow at their interests. But the wages they were receiving so far were not earned. They were paid them through subsidies of the state, that is at the expense of other members of society.

There are examples of a different nature.

Capable and diligent people working under family contracts, collective and team contracts, for instance Siberians in collectives of intensive work, produce 8-10 times greater volumes of output per person than in most farms of the country. Their earnings, naturally, grow, too, and this immediately attracts attention. Various commissions arrive to investigate. What can they do with such an amount of money, it is asked. But is this the way to pose the question? They have earned all this. Moreover, while the end result of their work increases many times over, the wages grow only by 50-100%. So there is a gain for society. If only things went like this everywhere....

Meanwhile some people are concerned lest this should lead to the development of private-owner psychology.

Are such fears justifiable? A person works on socially-owned land, under agreement with the board of a collective farm or the directorate of a state farm, uses material resources allocated to him. Everything is done with a high sense of responsibility, with talent. So how can he be regarded as a potential private owner? What socialist justice can there be in this case and the one mentioned earlier?

We should also ponder why it is that a person who worked honestly to earn his money is at times unable either to build the kind of house he wants or buy a cooperative flat or spend his earnings in some other way. The principle of socialism is violated in this case, too. A diligent worker and his family must be aware that the money earned honestly enables them to have higher living standards.

Perestroyka has a bearing on the interests not only in the material sphere. It comprises also the spiritual, cultural sphere. The comprehension of our road in the past, present and future is taking place. This is also a process that is far from painless. There are debates on our past history. Some or other stages of it are being critically analyzed.

This deepens our realization of what has been achieved by our people since the Great October. At the same time this enables us to assess the difficult periods of our history correctly, from the positions of truth. We must learn to live in the atmosphere of glasnost, of constant critical analysis of what has been achieved, what errors have been made.

Openness and criticism are a way of the control of the masses, of society over all the processes. This is also the way of summing up the experience accumulated, of sensing the main tendencies in society, of warning against errors. This is a normal state of things, and no one should panic when critical remarks are made.

Let us have a dignified attitude to criticism, let us respect each other. Sticking labels is absolutely inappropriate. At present, it is felt that what is written in magazine articles is at times determined by group preferences. Meanwhile the attention should be focused on the care for our common undertakings, the care for people.

True, everybody is saying now that they care for the country, the people, their artistic and cultural education. Under this flag attempts are sometimes made to gratify personal ambitions. This should be avoided. Let us not deny anyone the right to state his viewpoint, even if he held outdated views at some stage in the past. If he is consciously and honestly overcoming them now and joining the ranks of active participants in perestroyka, why reject him and deny him the opportunity to contribute to the common cause as best he can?

One should be above personal emotions and attitudes and should give priority to the interests of perestroyka. What words are used sometimes to brand an opponent!

Words can have a great effect, but they should not be used to the detriment of principledness. Those who want to take us to a different road, to add a different fuel to the "fire of perestroyka" should realize that this cannot be done. The Central Committee will firmly hold the Leninist positions, will be doing everything to expand the potential of socialist democracy, to deepen the process of perestroyka on the basis of socialist values.

No one is outside control in our country. We have just put an end to the state of things when certain persons in our party, certain "territories" have been outside control, outside criticism for years, and we shall not return to this state of things now. This applies to the mass media. The Soviet press is not a private shop. Let us recall again Lenin's premise that literature is part of the

common cause of the party. This is a fundamental provision and we continue being guided by it. We shall remain true to Lenin's ideas. The service to society, to one's people has always been characteristic of our intelligentsia and our literature.

Editors should have a sense of responsibility. I do not want to give names. We are talking in a comradely way. But it should be remembered that a magazine, a publishing house, a newspaper are not someone's private concern but a concern of the entire party, of the whole people. And we all are in the service of the people.

Our people are for perestroyka. So let us follow our line to perestroyka, to the development of socialist democracy together with the people. Let us assert our values together and wage the struggle for the invigoration of society.

When I speak about this, I am stressing time and again: We are for openness without reservations, without limitations, but for openness in the interests of socialism. We answer firmly to the question whether openness, criticism and democracy have limits: If openness, criticism and democracy are in the interests of socialism, in the interests of the people, then they have no limits.

This is the criterion. On this road we do not need someone else's standards: Neither in politics, nor in the spiritual sphere or the economy.

No one will go so far in the questions of democracy as we will because this is the essence of the socialist system. We are extending socialist democratism into all spheres, including the economy. Nowhere in the West do they elect directors and foremen, and work collectives endorse plans. This is what constitutes our socialist democracy.

We will push forward the process of democratization in the party as well. You probably can see how thoroughly we are conducting the campaign of reports by party committees. Things are changing for the better, and very seriously, although here as well there is a lot of inertia and passive attitudes. But the ordinary Communists, comrades, are not to be blamed. We know full well how many elected bodies of the party acted. Comrades, we have done little so far to make the elected bodies play the role which we have conceived and formulated in the CPSU rules. Everything is lying ahead. But if such processes will not take place in the party, neither will they happen in society.

We will seek new approaches to make better use of the soviets' potential. What is the use of talking, comrades, if in many cases party bodies took on many of their functions? What is the result? The party itself permitted lagging behind in this connection and overlooked many questions because it was overloaded with the functions uncharacteristic of it.

Now in the new conditions of economic reform and democratization, the party can really fulfill the functions of political vanguard. The questions of theory, ideological backup, cadre and national policy and international relations offer a wide scope for the party activity.

We are thoroughly preparing for the 19th all-union party conference. We are drafting the concept of holding it. We can already see that the questions of democratization in Soviet society will be key, central issues. We will cover everything here, including the electoral system, the court and law reform, improving control bodies in the country, etc.

The mass media must have their own say here. How is the perestroyka drive proceeding, what are its lessons, what conclusions can be drawn and what adjustments made to the policy of the party? I am convinced that there will be no shortage of serious proposals.

Now to the questions of economic reform and a changeover to cost accounting. What do I want to draw your attention to, comrades? First of all, to the complexity and importance of the nascent processes. We are making first steps in implementing the radical reform in conditions of the five-year plan period which has been drafted before the reform. We are trying to act so as not to wreck the five-year plan. Various enterprises found themselves in different economic and social conditions at the start. The picture is particularly motley here. Conditions at the start were different. Some have ended modernization, have new funds and are ready and can work successfully while others are only starting the most profound modernization which demands forces and time. All this has to be done simultaneously with introducing cost-accounting and self-financing. One can understand how far from simple all this is.

The press, however sometimes takes an easy approach to covering the activities of the collectives of enterprises in conditions of the ongoing reform. One has to bear in mind that we were fully aware that the old forms and the new methods of cost accounting will act simultaneously at a certain period.

Such is the transitional period with all the multitude of approaches. One has to outgrow it and draw lessons. We already know how people are changing even on approaches to cost-accounting. There are also many others who were lightminded. Now they will start to experience difficulties as was the case with the state-run quality control system. Nevertheless, the process has got under way and people are being retrained and getting involved in management. The reform already covers enterprises producing nearly 60% of output. This is tens of millions of working people.

We want the reform to gain momentum so that we could acquire experience and knowledge and be prepared and fully armed by the next five-year plan. Therefore, the task can be formulated as follows: to search and to

subject to convincing criticism all that runs counter to the reform both in science and in life. People are supporting us and understand that one has to act exactly in this way, to master new methods.

What are we wary about and what should we pay more attention to? To ease the difficulties involved in a switch-over to cost-accounting and self-financing we have created some reserves to keep afloat any enterprise which finds itself in a difficult situation at first and needs time to organize its work along the new lines. It will receive credits and aid to pay them back. We will control, of course, to prevent the money being wasted. All branch trade unions closely examined and supported the documents on reform. Hundreds of work collectives were involved in discussion. The reform documents and its principles deserve full trust and respect.

It is inadmissible when various articles fail to convey the feeling of pain for what is taking place. At times they easily and even dashingly pass a verdict on the fate of an enterprise or man. This is hardly the way to do it.

Let us put it straight: It took only two years to formulate the economic policy of the restructuring. To translate into life what we have conceived, a great amount of organizational work—patient, everyday and far from simple—will be needed. There are sure to be deviations.

Today openness must help introduce democratic attitudes and economic methods of management. It is especially important to search for and support everything that is new—new experience and new achievements. Much competence is needed. Involve scientists on a wider scale and not only those who have glib tongues. What is important is competence, solidity and everything that helps solve the problems of real life. We are facing a very responsible stage. The next two or three years will decide where the perestroyka drive will go. Two or three years! Therefore, one has to be especially attentive to the processes which are under way in the society.

It is even harder to imagine that everything can be foreseen. One needs to draw lessons from the past and work to change the situation for the better, so that aspiring and enterprising people ready for risk in the name of perestroyka could search for new approaches without fear, could impart acceleration to both thought and practical movement.

The press should discern these people and back them, be on the side of those who push forward perestroyka and our society along the road of rejuvenation. Here the positions must be clear-cut.

We are conducting the policy of perestroyka so that man may breathe freely in our society, so that his dignity may be respected and living conditions improve, so that the entire country may embark on the road of renewal.

The party is very interested, comrades, in seeing us all feel confident and work to full effect. Society is very much interested in that. Your stand, your understanding, being transformed through the mass media, through contact with the people, constitute a mighty support for our policy. That is why we are interested even more than at the initial stage in your constructive effort. This includes openness and sharp criticism. What is particularly important is that our press should actively defend people struggling for perestroyka.

Leaders of the party and government visited the other day an exhibition of machines. We were shown machinetools manufactured at the factory headed by A.I. Chabanov, the same man whom the party Central Committee and our press had once defended. I, too, had to raise that issue, as you remember. The man was saved. His machinetools are sold like hot cakes now, there are waiting lists to buy them. What had happened? He made a non-standard move, he disrupted old plans, discarded ancient instructions. Enviers turned up and launched such intrigues, found so many sins—he failed here and there. They would have beaten him, probably, had it not been for our intercession.

It is necessary, comrades, to fight till the end for every person who is a protagonist of perestroyka, who is flouted for initiative, for non-standard approaches—for every person and, it goes without saying, for whole work collectives.

IZVESTIYA correspondents recently described a collective farm where a third of its members were unable to have a general meeting convened to discuss vitally important issues of the collective farm's development.

The district party committee joined in, so did the executive committee—all those whose duty it was and wasn't—to crush the people's initiative, to prevent them from exercising their right. the newspaper was correct in interceding for the collective farmers. Soon a meeting was held, the people's proposals were backed. They were right.

What's of interest here? The initiators of the conflict in that collective farm strongly criticized the management, sharply raised issues, but no one left work. They worked well. Many of them are front-rank farmers. They should have been backed, their spirit should have been boosted. We ought to cultivate a democratic atmosphere, not to stop. That does not mean we can weaken responsibility, however.

I sometimes think: What complex developments are taking place across the vast expanses of our country involving nearly 300 million people. What a great time. If we stopped the emerging processes, got frightened by them, this would have most serious consequences, for we will not be able to mobilize our people for an undertaking of this scope one more time. But there are now some

people who are only watching what is taking place. At heart, they support perestroyka, but they have not as yet become involved in it by their deeds, actions, politically.

We feel that we all are in for a time of responsibility, and this responsibility should be assumed, comrades. The party will assume it, and so should you. I'm sure that this will be so. Each should be guided in that not by petty passions, but by the fate of the people. This does not blunt the acuity of struggle, does not narrow openness, democracy. This road must be followed. The process of renewal, democratization and further unfolding of the humanistic essence of socialism must be deepened and made an irreversible, permanent feature of our society.

The discussion began in a frank and principled atmosphere. The first to speak was M.N. Alekseyev, chief editor of the journal MOSKVA. He described the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles as one of the greatest events of the end of last year. It was a historic step of great psychological importance. Mankind has come to the brink of the nuclear abyss, shuddered, and recoiled, turning back toward common sense. We can never be reconciled to the inevitability of atomic warfare.

The speaker said that the struggle for survival on earth has now begun on yet another front—the ecological front. The writer spoke with anxiety of how the areas of plowland, including those in our country, are shrinking like the wild ass's skin.

He then shared his impressions of a trip to Saratov Oblast and expressed the fear: As a result of the transition to economic accountability, will not the poor farms become even poorer, since they have no means of paying for labor—there is practically nothing in the coffers? Yet formerly the kolkhoz member or sovkhoz worker did not himself feel the poverty of his farm, and was accustomed to receiving a guaranteed wage under any conditions.

The discussion then turned to the role of the press in publicizing our country's historical past. M.N. Alekseyev noted that for some reason we know the history of Britain, France, and Germany better than our own. You cannot raise conscious patriots of the motherland by depriving the people of their historical roots. The journal MOSKVA intends to publish in full N.M. Karamzin's "History of the Russian State" ["Istoriya Gosudarstva Rossiyskogo"].

After all, what is the situation? We do know the history of the Soviet period, but what about the other 1,000 years? From whose hands did we inherit that one-sixth part of the earth with the short name "Rus"? On what do we build our socialist fatherland?

M.S. Gorbachev: Incidentally, we sometimes forget the very great significance of this. Lenin said that "you can only become a communist when you have enriched your memory with a knowledge of all the wealth that mankind has created." And if we are talking about all mankind, then clearly we must know our own country's wealth.

M.N. Alekseyev: Indeed, history must not be deprived of its right to take part in our present-day affairs, in the education of our people.

V.A. Korotich, chief editor of the journal OGONEK, who then spoke, particularly stressed the need to consolidate the mass media workers in the struggle for the success of the restructuring.

The restoration of trust in the world must be associated with the restoration of good, human relations inside our country. That is an extremely important process which is only just getting under way. We cannot, I feel, speak of the establishment of a climate of trust, but perhaps we can speak of the establishment of the weather of trust. Here much good has been done. Of course, there have been errors too. But they were not aimed at the deliberate destruction of the restructuring.

That is why, it seems to me, the tone which we sometimes encounter in talking to each other is impermissible. You cannot substitute censure for debate. But we sometimes allow ourselves, especially in literary debates, to indulge in terminology appropriate to those boxers who sew lead weights into their gloves. I, for instance, am very worried about the accusations now used like labels, about "liberal terror," and so forth. People involved in a common cause cannot and should not express themselves in that way. Questions of our consolidation, questions of our unity are now of strategic importance. Unfortunately, we cannot, alas, yet say that we have finally rid ourselves of all those people who did us so much harm in the past. It is necessary to be prompt and merciless in cases where you can see that a person is not fussy about the means he uses to eliminate his opponent. The old methods of political labels and attempts to speak for the people, attempts to speak in the people's name, which are sometimes used in our country today, without proper justification, by this or that literary figure, in particular, are harmful and dangerous.

One of the main troubles and one of the main problems of the restructuring is our disunity, which remains very serious. Perhaps our journals would not print so many mutually hostile statements if the editors could simply work out some form of regular meetings and discussions among themselves, to "let off steam" in the course of personal contacts. We have scattered in all directions in pursuit of the common cause. And the fact that we have so little contact creates unnecessary problems. If we had more frequent contacts, perhaps many people's ambitions would not go off like bombs in the pages of the newspapers and journals.

So problems of consolidation, problems of the climate of trust, exist at home too. Many problems have their roots in us, ourselves. Much will depend on how we change, how we remake, how we transform ourselves.

Another thing. The report on the 70th anniversary of October opened a great many doors and gates and gave a great many clear pointers. We understood people's lives and the direction of our work. A commission was set up to study the most complex careers, the lives of those who created our country. While being aware of the full importance and complexity of the work of such a commission, I, as an editor, would like rehabilitation—where merited—to be carried out more intensively. We on OGONEK, however many items we print concerning figures from the past, try not to touch on those aspects that come within the competence of purely party organs. I will not go into this question deeply. But I would very much like to touch upon it, taking into account its importance and the interest in it that is revealed in the mail and at all the journal's meetings, when we receive thousands, literally thousands of letters and notes on these subjects. I would like the initiative that has been displayed so nobly and honestly by the party to develop with the same firmness, the same principled approach.

S.P. Zalygin, chief editor of the journal NOVYY MIR, spoke of the usefulness of conducting debates on priority areas of social and cultural life. A graphic example of this is the fate of the project to divert the waters of the northern rivers. This was a test of our social awareness, of the activeness of the intelligentsia and all strata of the population.

M.S. Gorbachev: A week ago we took a decision on these questions. We issued an instruction: to submit a draft based on protecting all water in general as a strategic raw material, and to impose order in the use of water. In the countryside, in industry, in the cities, everywhere. This will be a very important decision, and it should be comprehensive.

S.P. Zalygin: When a new water supply program is proposed, there are points there which wholly repudiate our decision on diverting the rivers.

M.S. Gorbachev: The draft program on the use of water does not mention the diversion of rivers.

S.P. Zalygin went on to touch on the problem of Lake Baykal, and expressed concern about the fate of that unique pearl of nature. It is necessary to dot all the "i's" in the endless debates about Baykal, as to whether they have any effectiveness. No, I am not saying that we are not progressing on these matters: Baykal, Ladoga, the diversion. It is unprecedented!

M.S. Gorbachev: We are restoring the Caspian, Azov.

S.P. Zalygin: Some 25 years ago I ran some articles on the Lower Ob. And you know, nobody was on my side—only two or three people. And now, the whole public!

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes, in general that is how the concept of hydroelectric power stations was worked out—by means of flooding land. Some 10-12 million hectares of the best land ended up under water! And that was the livestock raising base. Now we are carrying out land reclamation work to gain similar land and obtain feed from it.

S.P. Zalygin: While we are on the subject, we are now setting up a committee on environmental conservation. It is very necessary to approach this matter carefully and sensitively, because the very ministries that have been active in this area until now are handing over their conservation services to the committee. For instance, the water resources conservation service, which has perpetrated so many things, is being transferred to the committee. What can we expect from it?

M.S. Gorbachev: When we discussed this question, the question posed was: What kind of committee will it be—with or without economic units? Everyone spoke out, your opinion was conveyed to us. It must have nothing of its own. It must be independent, it must only monitor, it must have, apart from its staff, a huge entourage of experts, it must involve public figures, that is, everyone who is concerned about nature conservation, in this noble cause.

S.P. Zalygin: Yesterday Senator Bradley came to our editorial office, he runs the ministry of water resources [as published] in the United States. He and I had a talk, and he told me: Well, these ministries are the same all over the world, because we have not really learned yet to control the process of utilization of natural resources.

S.P. Zalygin also spoke of the poor implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution on the work of the creative unions. In the speaker's opinion, the blame for this rests first and foremost with the unions themselves.

G.Ya. Baklanov, chief editor of the journal ZNAMYA, noted that a time of radical changes in the country is truly a fateful time. Fatigue sets in—no, not fatigue from work, that would be a holiday, but from fruitless work, from people not seeing the results of their work for years and decades. Clearly the press too is to blame for this. A great deal has been said, but the most important thing that people must understand—that there is no other way, this is the last chance, either we backslide, or we remain the great country that the world follows—that is only being said now.

M.S. Gorbachev: Stopping is disastrous for us. That must not be permitted in any circumstances.

G.Ya. Baklanov: Many people are waiting for that disaster. But you know: People are for the restructuring, but many are still simply waiting to see what will come of it. If so many people had waited in wartime, we would not have won. Everyone must get moving as best they can. Here too, I think the press today needs to carry out a profound, bold analysis of what is happening, the economic and political aspects, the prospects. An analysis such that people finally grasp the full urgency of historical responsibility.

A few years ago people feared that if they reported some fact or other in the press, it would shake the foundations of our system. Now everyone talks openly about everything, and nothing has happened, the foundations are not shaken, but people can breathe more easily, more freely. Although there is still much inertia, people read, discuss, acknowledge that the question is formulated correctly, and do nothing, or start to act in such a way that everything gradually slows down.

The speaker noted the need to preserve the monuments of culture and history, and in particular raised the question of handing over Lev Tolstoy's estate at Yasnaya Polyana to the USSR Academy of Sciences and of the need to cultivate a respectful attitude to the memory of the Soviet patriots who died in the Great Patriotic War.

The next speaker, K.Yu. Lavrov, chairman of the USSR Union of Theater Workers board, spoke of the 1st year of this new creative organization's work and its active participation in the restructuring and spiritual renewal of the Soviet theater's life. Not much has yet been done, a quest is under way for something new, errors are being overcome, and the main criterion in this work is the ideological and artistic quality of works. Interesting meetings of the creative intelligentsia are being held. Great efforts are being made with a view to giving assistance to local theater organizations. There can be no question of any pomposity or bureaucratic orientation in these measures.

It seems to me, the speaker stated, that the greatest danger in our work now is verbosity. We need fewer words and more action. That applies both to us and to local culture organs. Often the people on the periphery repeat, from habit, what people higher up say about the restructuring, but other than that, nobody lifts a finger. The situation at many oblast and city theaters remains difficult and neglected.

In conclusion K.Yu. Lavrov spoke of creative contacts and cooperation beween Soviet theater organizations and their foreign partners.

I.D. Laptev, chief editor of IZVESTIYA, on the basis of an analysis of the work of the press in the past year and the opinions of the readership, noted the most characteristic phenomena of public life. People's confidence that the right course has been chosen is growing firmer and increasing. Life has shown that democracy and glasnost are indeed levers for the restructuring, incentives and stimuli for it. The desire for changes, far from lessening, has strengthened. At the same time a certain reluctance to speak about our defects has appeared.

The year 1988 must be, especially for the mass media, a year of defending the ideas and practice of restructuring. It will be particularly difficult in connection with the gigantic job of restructuring the economy that has begun. Here too we must not make a fuss, but work calmly, seriously, and thoughtfully.

Going on to speak of the importance of propagandizing positive experience, I.D. Laptev stressed that here the idea must be not simply to describe new work, new machines, but to show how new relations, new forms of labor organization are becoming established, that is, the technology of experience.

M.S. Gorbachev: You have begun well in showing in the newspapers, without embellishments, how innovations are born through struggle, how problems are resolved.

I.D. Laptev: The problem of regulating legal relations in the economy and of compliance with the Law on the State Enterprise is assuming paramount significance today.

In this situation it is important to know how to keep people's interest in the press and maintain the high spiritual pitch of society's life today. But here an enormous difficulty faces us. This difficulty is not simply whether to write or not to write about something, but how to avoid maintaining or even sowing illusions, how to avoid falling into cheap sensation, the pursuit of something "daring," so to speak. The readers' mail shows that questions of economic restructuring, questions of the organization of production, wages, pricing, democratization, the organization of elections in a new way—these are the major questions that are most interesting today.

M.S. Gorbachev: When they are demonstrated through debate, through struggle. A newspaper or journal is something public. If it presents only one viewpoint and there is no exchange of opinions, what happens then? Will it be clan against clan and group against group? It is necessary to unite around the people's destiny, the people's pain and joy.

I.D. Laptev then touched on questions of improving the quality of journalists' work, journalists' expertise. He stressed that these questions have acquired special importance today, a political character. After all, a particular newspaper item can literally stir up millions of people. In this connection it is necessary to embark on a serious study of the actual influence of the media on readers, viewers, and listeners. We must really bring into play such a mighty reserve of glasnost as local media.

The speaker also drew attention to the problems of improving legislation and the legal status of the media and providing them with a material base.

The paramount prerequisite and most important component of restructuring, USSR Academy of Sciences Vice President P.N. Fedoseyev said, is the theoretical and political elaboration of pressing problems of domestic and foreign policy which the party has carried out in recent years. The approaches of the new thinking are of fundamental significance here. It is a new, fresh look at our society, at the world, at history from the viewpoint of Marxism-Leninism. The documents of the 70th anniversary of October are a striking embodiment of the new thinking. They are in fact a new view of all spheres of the life of Soviet society, the socialist countries, the developing countries, and the capitalist world and of the problems facing the world. In fact, certain dogmas had been established which were a hindrance in foreign and in domestic policy, and the fact that the Central Committee April plenum, the 27th congress, and subsequent party documents did away with these dogmas is of colossal international and domestic political significance.

For example, there was the widespread dogma that peaceful coexistence is a form of class struggle, that it aids the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries. And when we talked about peace and about peaceful coexistence, we were not really believed. What kind of peace is it, they said, what kind of peaceful coexistence, if it aids the class struggle in our countries?

Of course, the absence of this thesis in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and party program untied our hands, one might say, in the area of foreign policy and put everything on a correct footing. Peaceful coexistence is an area of interstate relations and presupposes noninterference in internal affairs. Indeed, we are for peace, cooperation, and collaboration between states, while questions of the class struggle are an internal matter for each country.

Or take another dogma, that under socialism our production relations correspond completely with the development of production forces. We reiterated this formula for a long time, not really considering that, of course, at some stage they do correspond, completely correspond, in fact, but then they begin to conflict. But the social scientists had neither the strength nor the determination to draw consistent conclusions. It was not until the Central Committee April plenum and 27th party congress that this dogma was smashed.

Social scientists are operating at all stages of restructuring; in the spheres of the economy, social relations, culture, and consciousness. I want to stress that it is man and the problems of humanism that take center stage here. A correct understanding of these problems and coverage of them in the media are exceedingly important.

We scholars are rightly criticized for being sluggish, for lagging behind. Particularly in the elaboration of specific approaches and strategic lines. We have written rather a lot of general theses pertaining to economic reform and the development of democracy. But there are still not enough approaches to the implementation of these basic levers of restructuring. Complex strategic questions of economic reform have not been studied enough either. We are aware of this.

Yes, it is science and particularly social science that need above all to be dynamic. There is an abundance of stagnation phenomena and conservatism here. Cadres are slow to restructure, and some think that they do not need to restructure at all, they are operating so well. So once again I want in conclusion to stress that we need more dynamism.

The biggest difficulty we have encountered, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Chief Editor V.V. Chikin said, is the readers' rather persistent demand for less talk about restructuring and more concrete material on its results: Give us the concrete results over the 2 years, show us the best experience, and so forth. It is probably the most complex and difficult task facing every editorial collective. There are several problems here.

First. We are not exactly abounding in sources. It must be borne in mind that at the moment at local level—organizations and people even—they are very diffident when it comes to studying their experience, generalizing, and giving good marks. It is a time of self-criticism, it is a time of many initiatives. No one is in a hurry to claim a particular result as a victory. But there is an enormous need for this experience, for some real results.

Also I think that we journalists need to sharpen our eyes; there are many things we have failed to notice, we have been unable to distinguish, to single things out. This has made for superficial assessments and views.

Accountability reports on restructuring are currently being given at plenums and meetings. We are publishing a lot of material on this, but again the sources of experience we have established are few. On the whole, the reports themselves and the plenums have been very interesting, there have been many unusual forms, many sharp observations, and keen attention to the speeches. We had an item from Yaroslavl...

M.S. Gorbachev: A fine, interesting item. Generally, your coverage of the reports has been very interesting, particularly when you have used dialogue and conflict of opinions—that is interesting and instructive.

V.V. Chikin: I would also like to say that, of course, one aspect of the experience is the presentation of restructuring at the individual level. We tried a series of features on the superintendents of restructuring. We have now done 23 or 24, but I confess we do not have the manpower. We turned to writers. There are several

comrades who are on friendly terms with the paper. There is Ivan Vasilyev, Vladimir Sitnikov, but to dispatch someone from Moscow to the restructuring front, as they did in the forties, is very difficult.

M.S. Gorbachev: "Dispatch" is an expression from bureaucratic command methods. Invite them. We can find such people in Moscow, you shouldn't be doing that.

V.V. Chikin: It would be a blessing, but at the moment people are more interested in our printing what was not printed 15 or 20 years ago.

When we talk about the concrete phenomena of today there is, however, a great need to link this to our entire idea of socialism. We have come up with the splendid, in my view, very flexible, clear formula "more socialism." But more means an increase. All current phenomena are linked to our roots. Collective contracts, the cooperative movement, economic accountability, and so forth—it all stems from the essential nature of socialism and there is no need for us to go about destroying this history of the socialist movement. By skillfully demonstrating the alien, stagnant, and inhibiting elements, we will see the socialist ground that people stand on, that is part of their lives; to avoid any ideological homelessness.

It is no secret that our ideological opponents are trying to impose on us the idea that we can solve our problems not by following the socialist path but by resurrecting the private ownership figure, the capitalist.

The immense historical optimism of the report on the 70th anniversary of October made a big impression on me, on all of us. This is a good basis, we must settle down to some historical research and engage in our daily activities. Unfortunately, in my view, items in the press these days are not always in that vein. There is a fuss over history. I am referring to the fuss created, in my view, by the seamy side of people's souls. For instance, a document was published yesterday—the Politburo decision restoring the names Naberezhnyye Chelny and Cheremushki. A very rigorous, considered document. We know that people want to talk and think about this. In IZVESTIYA I read a very small, but sympathetic item conmcerning the larger political aspects of life, but it was delicate and reasonable. Then, in another paper, I came across quite a different kind of article.

Voice: In MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA.

V.V. Chikin: There are phrases which sound for all the world like blasphemy.

M.S. Gorbachev: It showed a tendency toward sensationalism. Is this a quality our press should have? Let us write seriously about the most difficult things: today's and yesterday's, but in a responsible, scientific way, in order to elaborate difficult material in the right way. If mistakes have been made they must be rectified, even the most serious ones. Haven't we the courage to do this? We have embarked on the revolutionary task of bringing the country out of stagnation, so haven't we the courage to discuss these problems in such a way as to be unanimous in our decisions and steps?

I want the principles of socialism, democracy, glasnost, and criticism to triumph here. I want there to be honesty and frankness. And everything, of course, in the interests of the people, not for the sake of some cheap sensation.

We have courageously analyzed our errors. Has there been such an analysis since Lenin? A comprehensive, balanced analysis. I think you are aware that we could find many telling facts to illustrate our very serious conclusions and theses, on any question. But are we concerned here only with facts, in order to inflame passions? I am convinced that this is not our path. We must build and renew socialism, stir our society, using all the juices supplied by the roots that go back deep into our history, particularly socialist history, lopping off all the negative elements from the thirties and forties and from the recent period of stagnation.

We have to go ahead and look ahead. The purpose of the heart-to-heart talks is for things to sink in. So there must be no slipping back, no retreat, on the contrary—onward and onward!

In his speech NOVOSTI board chairman V.M. Falin said:

The time we are in now is distinguished, it seems to me, by, among other things, one particular feature: the increasing spiritual requirements of all the peoples and the increasing spiritual factor in the life of each people and each state.

All the mistakes we have made in history must remain in the past. We have no right to repeat mistakes, to make new mistakes and correct ourselves again in 10-15 years' time.

We have exhausted our credit of trust or have nearly done so. Today we can only write the truth, the whole truth. If we are not capable of telling the truth today it is better not to say anything for a while until we can say it later, but say it as it should be said. But when talking about history we have often, of late, gotten carried away and started beating our breasts. When talking about history we mean the history of the Soviet state and Russia. It is not we alone who are exhausting history; much of what is in our history is the product, the reflection of events which took place outside our country, which were the result of our relations with other countries, which impinged on our reality from outside.

Today, V.M. Falin went on, if we follow very closely reactions in the West to restructuring, to the results of the Washington visit and what comes after Washington, we can easily see that they are beginning to place the emphasis not on the the elements that were present last

year and the year before last. There is no longer any rapture in connection with renewal, democratization, and glasnost. On the contrary.

M.S. Gorbachev: Most important, they are trying to sow uncertainty among our people. Everything that comes to our country in Russian and the other languages of the peoples is geared to sowing doubts about our ability to implement restructuring.

V.M. Falin: That is one side of the coin. The other is maintaining and adding new material, fuel to the distrust which existed there. In this connection I want to say that this is a very serious intention. After World War I the Americans adopted such a hostile stance against us that the U.S. soldier, returning from the front, rebelled against his own system. The U.S. worker, after the October Revolution, demanded social rights. After World War II there was a change in attitude toward the Soviet Union not only because the Americans did not want to share the fruits of victory with us. The U.S. Administration was frightened lest the feelings of friendship toward the Soviet Union should affect the state's domestic and foreign policy.

This was admitted by Sulzberger in 1946, it has been admitted by respectable scholars in their works, and it is a true and real fact. There is a U.S. intelligence document recommending that the United States quit the coalition with the Soviet Union in 1943 and joint fascist Germany to wage a joint struggle against the Soviet Union. That was in August 1943, immediately after the Kursk Bulge. So if we look closely at what is happening in the United States we must regard this change of mood as an indication that very serious changes are brewing and be ready for this.

Going on to dwell on the reserves of the Soviet press in the cause of restructuring, glasnost, and democratization, the speaker pointed out that much can be done by means of expedient, purposeful, and systematic actions. It is necessary to strive for consonance between what is published in the press and the consequences that such publication will have. However, this does not always happen. Sometimes a scandalous fact is exposed in a newspaper, and the reader awaits a reaction which does not come. One wonders: Why, then, make people concerned? It turns out that all of glasnost boils down just to the right to speak about something that used not to be allowed to be talked about, while the consequences of the criticism go overboard. The speaker drew attention to the fact that new braking mechanisms are already emerging now, having been created in the process of restructuring.

V.G. Afanasyev, PRAVDA chief editor, spoke next. He pointed out: Our press, and PRAVDA not least, worked well at the first stage of restructuring, when it was necessary to take stock, so to speak, of what we had, where we stood, what problems we had, what blunders, mistakes, and shortcomings, and where we were to go from there. At the same time, we all became pretty skilled at criticism. But then, having given the matter some thought and taken into account both the 27th party congress decisions and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statements, it was impossible not to arrive at the conclusion that you cannot carry out restructuring by criticism alone. Then we encountered the most difficult thing. Here, let us state frankly, PRAVDA gave up in some respects and was for a while in a state of some confusion—for which we were justly criticized at one of the big conferences. We have drawn conclusions from that and taken a number of emergency and long-term measures.

We believe that the most important thing for the press now, at the second stage of restructuring, is to seek, disseminate, and support progressive experience of restructuring in its very different aspects: human, technological, and sociopsychological. Here we must maintain a closer link with party organs and with departments and the leadership of the party Central Committee so that we can obtain addresses, names, and various kinds of advice and wishes.

Further. Our performance in seeking this experience is poor. In places we do not even know how to seek. Why? Because we journalists are insufficiently prepared to work under the new conditions and to resolve the new, modern problems. Take commodity-money relations. We have not tackled them. Science has not seriously tackled them. Take the cooperative movement and individual labor activity—again we have not tackled this. Take the human, sociopsychological aspects of our life—we have not tackled this matter either. Therefore we have begun to relearn. We have begun involving more scientists and competent, knowledgeable people, but science is, unfortunately, still a bad helper for us. A topical, interesting, modern article is needed, for example. You go round institutes and ring round all the academicians and candidate academicians, but you do not find the required article. Another time we have, perhaps, to do something in an insufficiently skilled way—for which we are criticized. Therefore, we too have to learn to master new problems, and it is evidently necessary also to take our social sciences in hand most earnestly.

V.G. Afanasyev emphasized that mechanisms for braking criticism have recently been reproduced in the press. There is figure padding and disparity between measures taken following critical articles. There are transfers from one job to another. Probably the most widespread method is to find a small inaccuracy and a second small inaccuracy in a critical material and, although the article is in principle correct, start overturning the whole material. Unfortunately, we do not always meet with the support of party organs locally.

The question of the "gaps" in our history, the PRAVDA chief editor went on to say, was raised most directly in the report devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October. It stated that we have to eliminate these "gaps."

V.G. Afanasyev went on to say that certain authors who tackle these subjects have neither the proper knowledge nor a sense of responsibility. Yet it is a question of the history of a great country and party. What is needed here is exactingness, balance, and accuracy. In this connection the speaker made critical remarks about M. Shatrov's play "On... On... On!"

V.G. Afanasyev urged his journalist colleagues not to waive party principles and to be strictly guided by them in the policy elaborated by the CPSU Central Committee, the 27th party congress, and subsequent Central Committee plenums.

E.G. Klimov, first secretary of the USSR Cinematographers Union Board, spoke of the union's desire to create in its work an atmosphere of absolute glasnost and open, comradely dialogue. This is a very important means of consolidating all our forces, he emphasized. We must learn to explain ourselves, argue, and listen to each other. To this end a scientific center has been set up in our union, on which sociologists, in particular, are represented. On the basis of a poll of literally all the union's members a corresponding analysis is being made, which is helping to correct our activity.

Touching on the subject of "Reform and the Cinema," the speaker pointed out that it is not proceeding simply. What was once hidden "under water" has now become far more visible. By virtue of the fact that the reform has begun quite palpably to affect the interests of specific people, phenomena have begun to emerge whose existence we did not even suspect previously. This is characteristic of the restructuring process throughout the country, in all spheres.

Is this good or bad? It is better to know than not to know what has risen from the bottom. Are there opponents of restructuring in the cinema? There are, and they openly call for a return to the times when a certain center prescribed which movie certain people should make. They want to preserve the old system of people waiting in line to make a picture, with everyone making his own movie in turn, with state money, naturally. But is this creativity, when everyone must work while preserving the principle of taking turns? Our reform presupposes creative competition. Only an interesting, problem-centered, truthful idea, backed by the talent of creators, has the right to be staged. Now, perhaps more than ever before, mass interest in living and creating in a different way has manifested itself.

The speaker went on to touch on the question of movie copyright. Its positive resolution, he believes, will prevent the "cutting" of our movies by 45-60 minutes, as was done, for example, with the movie "Agony" in France and the United States, from which all political scenes were removed.

E.G. Klimov named the republic state cinematography committees as a superfluous, braking component. There is a proposal which ideally fits in with our reform, he pointed out—the creation of economically accountable production associations. The large republics are moving toward this solution of the problem, the speaker elaborated. But the others favor a merger with the local ministries of culture and the creation of organizations and committees which would embrace the cinema, the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, and the Ministry of Culture. In my view, what is needed is a unified sector responsible for the whole of the cinema.

The speaker also drew the audience's attention to the problem of organizing an R. Karmen museum which will gather together the works and documents of frontline cameramen. We believe, he said, that such museums must be opened. But the Moscow City Soviet does not believe so. It disregards many articles in central newspapers and PROZHEKTOR PERESTROYKI [searchlight of restructuring] articles.

Such meetings at the Central Committee have become an excellent lesson in openness, trust, and responsibility, M.F. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, said. They have a tremendous impact on the nature and substance of our work. I recently read the following in an article: Two compulsory conditions are needed to make changes possible in society. First, great goals. Second, great resistance.

We really do have great goals—both social and public. Revolutionary goals! On the other hand, we also have resistance. We do not have the right to underestimate this. I speak of this because I proceed from the problems which publishers are now experiencing. We realize that the greatest harm was caused to publishing by unthinking obedience, when everything was organized on the basis of the severest centralism: This must be published, but not this. We are now seeking to unshackle the democratic publishing process. This process is such a minefield of tremendous barriers, reviews, and opinions that it is quite difficult for a new author with fresh ideas which do not fit the old conventions to get published. Therefore an opinion-book, a polemic-book, a dialogue-book is still a rarity. Having obtained support from the party Central Committee, we have taken radical measures. We have adopted, for example, this decision: Every author has the right to full independence, to his own interpretation of a particular phenomenon. The publishing house may say in the foreword to a book that it does not share the author's position in some way but that it deems it necessary to publish it so that the reader can himself assess the work's merit.

Going on to dwell on the publishing houses' thematic plans, the speaker admitted that there are no changes here. Many monographs, he pointed out, were written 2-3 years ago and contain no new ideas. The thing is that

in publishing houses it is far easier to work on instructions. Many people understand restructuring in the publishing process like this: There have been incorrect commands, but now we have restructuring and, consequently, other, more sensible commands will be issued. Which book to publish and which not to publish—the publishing house alone must decide this. We must tackle the strategy of publishing policy and grand ideology, not particular, petty, administrative ideology.

The speaker touched on problems connected with strengthening the sector's material and technical base and pointed out that the paper shortage frequently stumps those editors whose publications are in sharply increased demand. They ought to be rejoicing, but they are sorrowful: Where to get the paper for an increased print run, he remarked.

I also wish to emphasize that our printing trade is almost the most laggard sector. We have nowhere else to retreat to. Nevertheless, the decisions adopted on its development are not being fulfilled. They have not lifted a finger either at the machine-building ministries, or at the construction ministries, or at the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry. Surely we want to produce sufficient quantities of historical literature, say? There was a period in its publication when we deprived people of the possibility of fully understanding and assessing Russian sociopolitical thought. Now there is an entire program for the publication of such literature, and we have begun implementing it. Yet our potential is so limited that the production of an additional 10,000 copies of a book is a problem that is frequently hard to resolve. The number of subsciption copies of Solovyev and Klyuchevskiy has been increased from 50,000 to 200,000. Of course, the demand is immeasurably greater. But we cannot satisfy it. We do not have the resources.

We need very real assistance, for this is an extremely important and essential matter. Our polygraphic machine building will be unable to give us anything of good quality over the next 5-7 years, and we also need finally to resolve the paper problem.

V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union Board, pointed to the increasing prestige of the written word. All journals, he said, have increased their circulation. NOVYY MIR's, for example, has doubled, DRUZHBA NARODOV's has increased fivefold, and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has added a further 700,000 subscribers to its permanent readership. The circulation has increased, of course, not only because of promises to publish some sensational and "hot" things. Perhaps this too—I do not deny—has influenced a certain section of readers.

A voice: A small section, 90% in all. (Laughter in the hall).

V.V. Karpov: Maybe so. Many readers ask whether the artistic standard in them is high. Yes, "Children of the Arbat" is necessary, it is ardent and interesting. "White Coats" too. But what about artistic standards? Perhaps these too are some landmarks of the times? Readers also caution: Mind a new state of affairs does not arise and the following does not happen: You have said two words about repressions and various kinds of negative things and stuck on a further 300 pages of mediocre material.

Now a few words about economic accountability. As I understand it, it is for all of us. Why, then, should the Writers' Union not live by economic accountability? We have long been economically accountable.

M.S. Gorbachev: Under economic accountability there is also a tax policy.

V.V. Karpov urged newspaper leaders to involve young writers more frequently in cooperation and to send them on business trips. In conclusion the speaker noted the need for a prompt solution to the problem of the paper shortage.

Mikhail Gorbachev: Let is wind up our meeting. When I was preparing for it I asked for the 1985-1987 statistics. What has happened and is happening with our economy and the social sphere over these years? The data here are very eloquent. We were always concerned about the growth of the productivity of labor, for example. But in the past three years the rates of growth of the productivity of labor have exceeded the average annual indices in the eleventh five-year period in industry by 1.3 times, in construction by 1.6 times, in agriculture by 2.8 times, on railways by 3.6 times. If the growth of the productivity of social labor accounted for 86% of the growth of the national income between 1981 and 1984 and for 95% in 1985-1986, in 1987 it accounted for 100%. In industry, this was achieved while the workforce was reduced.

It is very important that the situation has changed for the better in the rates of growth of renumeration and the productivity of social labor. This was always our worst bottleneck. Look at the situation in 1981-1984, the most alarming years. The growth of wages of workers engaged in material production was 17% higher than the growth of the productivity of labor. In other words, they paid money, but there was no return on it.

Now a wage increase is tied to growth of the productivity of labor. The economic mechanism has started working, even as we were only approaching the reform, comrades. This is the first.

Second. No less important is the fact that qualitative changes are also taking place in the field of scientific and technical progress. The main emphasis here is laid on primary engineering—machine tool building, electrical

engineering, instrument making and other industries which must ensure the solution of scientific and technical problems, the development of food and light industries and the social sphere.

The product lines in these industries were renewed 2.9 times faster in 1987 than in 1985. I must admit that we ourselves were somewhat surprised during our recent visit to the engineering exhibition. There was a perceptible change, even though we have not taken all the decisions and have been working on the program to modernise our engineering only for the second year.

What does the exhibition show? Products were compatible with those of the world level and even superseded them. Moreover, if 15-20% were samples which have only passed tests, the rest were already in batch production. Once our people—scientists, technicians and workers—started to work, things began to run smoothly.

You know that our engineering was treated in such a way in the past that it found itself simply neglected. The oil boom allowed us to earn foreign currency, and we thoughtlessly bought equipment to solve production tasks, purchased spare parts, without developing our own engineering and science properly. This "import plague", as it was aptly called by academician A.P. Aleksandrov, actually stifled the process of scientific and technical development.

All this was happening in our huge country which cannot afford technical dependence on anyone at all. We found ourselves literally in a corner. A complex turnaround had to be made. Only now we have moved forward: The computer technology started to make progress as competing collectives of scientists came close to developing, for example, computers capable of handling a billion operations per second. In the next few years they are to be followed by machines with the speed of 10 billion operations per second, and computers with speeds of 30, 50 and even 100 billion operations per second will not be late in coming.

And the tasks continue growing. Do you realize what potential our society has? The acceleration has been started.

This was reflected by the exhibition which has already been visited by half a million of people, which is a sort of commentary on it.

The progressive transformations in agriculture continue from around 1983. This is a steady trend. The productivity in livestock breeding has been growing all these years, and the growth in all kinds of products is taking place now. We had a complex legacy from the years of stagnation. Therefore we are obliged to develop restructuring on the basis of scientific and technological progress, the increase of personal interest and the democratization of social and economic processes. Such is our path.

We have no room for retreating. We have considered how the national income for various branches is growing. We shall have a smaller volume of the national income than we could have had because of the foreign trade, since the situation with petroleum is unfavorable, and also because of the falloff of receipts from vodka sales. But you know that the long-term social and economic policy should not be based on circumstancial considerations, the way we have done until recently. Therefore the turns we are making now are very much needed and well substantiated. We intend to open every door to the agrarian sector. We have actually already adopted decisions removing every obstacle to its development. The psychology of managers is the hitch now while the people are ready for initiative, for responsibility, for taking risks with which agriculture is associated for they believe in their own resources and have already proved it everywhere.

We now open broad opportunities for kolkhozes and sovkhozes from the viewpoint of independence, of economic conditions and technology. I think we shall achieve stability in the agrarian sector and, certainly, in crop-growing particularly.

Consider what interesting processes take place in other areas. We have done a lot to enhance the social tendency of our entire national economy. What does this yield? This turn is in progress, but the rate of growth of capital investments for these purposes, for the creation of the material basis of the social sphere in 1987, was thrice as great as in the national economy as a whole. What do we have as a result? Take the years 1985-1987. In these three years the average annual commissioning of housing rose by 9%, of schools by 28%, vocational technical schools—4%, pre-school institutions—10%, hospitals—9%, polyclinics—24%, clubs—46%. The housing conditions of 32 million people were improved over these years. Interesting figures, indeed.

The consumption of material goods and services by the population has increased. The absolute average annual growth of consumption in 1985-1987 made up R18 billion as against R11 billion in the previous three years. Hence, the absolute increase made up R7 billion. I dwell on these facts because all we have undertaken is for the sake of the people and it is the people that have the final say. And people responded and supported perestroyka by their work. This is the main thing, for this precisely is what determines our huge potentialities in all areas. Does any other country have such potentialities?

It can be said: How can it be that statistics report the growth of consumption, while we still lack everything? We feel this acutely.

The reason is that the monetary incomes grew on one curve while the trade turnover grew on another. Consumption was increasing but the solvent demand was growing even faster. So the demand not met by supply was increasing. This is why we are short of everything.

It was mentioned here that novelty in economic activity at times gives rise to some doubts, even suspicions. When work is done to meet the needs of people, to improve the living standards of people, this should be welcomed. But we must not and will not tolerate any elements of grabbing. We have economic, social and political mechanisms to protect us against this.

I would also like to mention another thing. The interest in people should be maintained. This principle is applied in the whole world, and it should be applied in our country. Consider the fact that 13,000 various cooperatives already operate in the country, more than 300,000 people are engaged in individual labor activity. This is not very much for a country such as ours, but the initial step, nevertheless, has been taken.

What is achieved by our line at the invigoration of society and economy and improvement of the social climate, including the effort to combat drunkenness and alcoholism? Here are some demographic data. They are not without interest for all of us.

The average annual mortality in 1986-1987 was 200,000 people less than in 1984, and mortality of able-bodied men as a result of accidents decreased by 37%. Drunkenness entails violation of safety rules, accidents, traumas. People in their prime were dying. It was not easy to alter that tendency, but it has been altered.

Birth rate increased in the past two years. 5.6 million babies annually were born over this period, while 4.9 million babies were born in 1980. The strengthening of the family is an important thing. People see prospects now and their confidence increased. Moral improvement took place above all. We have been thoroughly engaged in improving health services. The average life expectancy of the entire population increased by nearly two years while the life expectancy of men increased by 2.6 years.

This all is certainly nothing accidental. I would say this is another proof that the entire society is overcoming stagnation. But the positive tendencies have just started manifesting themselves.

I think the positive processes will be growing now that we bring economic factors into play, develop glasnost and democracy, that social initiative is stimulated by every means. We shall certainly have ailments more than once, and our ailments will not be easy, but we shall strengthen and shall be advancing ever more confidently. The Politburo, the government are absolutely certain that we shall be advancing. Therefore entering a most complex stage of perestroyka when we shall come up against many new problems, we shall not panic and shall not be nervous. Perhaps we shall even have to retreat somewhere if it turns out that we made an error. The undertakings we have embarked on are not simple, and we shall not fear mistakes. We shall firmly advance along the charted road.

We must certainly make fewer mistakes. It is believed that those who do nothing make fewer mistakes than anybody. But doing nothing is precisely the gravest of mistakes.

I wish to thank you sincerely for responding to the invitation to share your views about perestroyka.

I see that we are in full accord, that we fully understand responsibility and historic significance of the stage which we have entered. This is in itself extremely important, I would tell you. This understanding should transform into deeds, into actions. This is for one.

Secondly. All understand that we are in for big work. It will be very good if we bring that understanding home to our people. We succeeded in accomplishing much in this area in the past year. Perestroyka brought to life a kind of revolution of expectations. But initially, the expectations were as follows: A good man will come, and everything will go by itself, and boons will fall down as manna from heaven. The people now realize that we should cover a path that will not be easy before we achieve tangible positive results for society, for each family and each individual—in the moral and material sense.

Everything that we have defined should be done on the basis of perestroyka, on the basis of new approaches, on the basis of preserving and upholding the atmosphere that has been established in the country. This understanding should be further supported and consolidated. It is necessary to boost the morale of the people, comrades.

I'll put it bluntly: People need the truth. When they are told the truth, they will do everything in a selfless way, despite any hardships. When lies are palmed off upon them, packed in pink, this generates apathy. People are very senitive to good attitudes; they regard absence of truth as disrespect for them. Our nation is very educated and knowledgeable now, probably one of the most educated and knowledgeable nations in the world. People are very sensitive not only to honest earnings, but also to a good atmosphere, to a respectful attitude towards them, to honor and fame for their conscientious work.

Recall our history—our people have always been ready for self-sacrifice. This must not be forgotten. But it must not be abused either.

By the way, about our history. Many issues were raised here. I'll touch only upon several of them. The principled stance on issues of our history was formulated in party documents related to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Our understanding of historical processes, their reviewing, should be deepened on their basis. But there should be no excess here.

I ought to tell you that the Central Committee's commission, set up in line with decisions of the October 1987 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee to consider many complex issues of our history, is working. Some first results of its work will probably be published before the 19th party conference.

The Politburo discussed at one of its latest meetings the issue of what "Essays on CPSU History" should be like. Great interest is shown in that. It is necessary that the "Essays" be truthful, for a truthful word about our history, comrades, is our common heritage, our strength. It is therefore a great undertaking to write a good, truthful book that could become a textbook of CPSU history. We think that, probably, this task cannot be resolved now without the Central Committee's assistance. It is necessary to set into motion our entire potential so as to cope best with the task. Of course, the bulk of effort is up to scientists possessing the necessary scientific background. It is necessary to set up a good task force that would include creative, principled and competent people. Indeed, there must be a group of authors, but there should probably also be the commission of the CPSU Central Committee.

The work ahead is large in scale and important. This is our history with everything that it has. We studied, mastered new values in the economy and spiritual culture, and moved forward along the path of progress. We studied, made miscalculations and errors, drawing lessons even from difficult, tragic periods of our history.

Any smoothing-down of history is unacceptable for us. History is already in existence [ona uzhe yest]. It is only to be truthfully depicted. This is up to our honesty and responsibility and a scientific approach. We appreciate everything that was great in our history, but we cannot forgive those who perpetrated lawlessness, the more so crimes.

I see no grounds for cutting roots underneath. The truth is one. We cannot divide it into periods. Our history took place, and it should be known and analyzed in a true way.

It is the richest science. The more we address ourselves to it, the more we understand what we must do today and tomorrow.

We come to this earth but once. The attitude to man, to his life and to all his work must be respectful and honest, especially with regard to those who bore on their shoulders the onus of struggle at the sharp turns of our history. Injustice and disrespect must not be allowed with regard to an individual, the more so with regard to a whole generation. That will be a crime. If our system has withstood all the trials that befell the Soviet people, including those that hit us all like bursts of submachine-gun fire from the past—this means it is a durable system backed by the population, a system that we should try to truthfully portray in all stages of its emergence and development.

A dialectical approach, rather than wavering from black to white are required. There are no such things in life—everything is going side by side, in struggle and in interrelationship. I would like very much to see that we fully share the understanding of that—one half-truth should not be replaced with another half-truth; all that is our history with all its achievements, losses and tragedies.

We take pride in our history, each day of it, because even when people, the glory of motherland, unjustly perished, even at those hard times factory workers, farmers and intellectuals worked, upheld life and raised the country to new heights of progress. That's why when we talk of history, we don't want to exalt or overthrow individuals, but we give due to the people, the decisive force in history.

The dialectic is not easy here, comrades. But that is the only way for moving forward, while honestly analyzing history and drawing conclusions for today. At the beginning of our meeting I touched but briefly on that subject. You raised it, so I found it necessary to speak out once again on what concerns our history.

Returning to topical tasks of perestroyka, I want to stress once again that the main thing now is to boost the morale of the people, to back their struggle for restructuring. It is necessary to show perestroyka in the real struggle of social forces. People want changes, they want to take part in the restructuring drive, but in many cases they simply don't know how. They don't know—that's too bad, comrades.

It is necessary to help people master new approaches. It is necessary to address oneself also to the past, to draw from it everything that could well serve our cause. We should act using the method of dialectical negation: to absorb everything that is best, everything that is useful and once worked, served us at all stages. Everything obsolete, outdated must be discarded and replaced with new things. Such is our formula.

The CPSU Leadership pins great hopes in handling new, major tasks of the new stage of restructuring also on those who are present here. Let us move forward confidently and firmly, and let you have no doubts: We shall not give up positions in the policy of restructuring. We are committed to this policy till the end. The choice has been made, we shall not swerve from it. But it is necessary, comrades, to raise the entire society, the entire country.

I wish you success.

Razumovskiy Addresses Uzbekistan Plenum
LD121912 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Tashkent January 12 TASS—The Central Committee of Uzbekistan's Communist Party considered an organizational issue at its plenary meeting today.

The plenum relieved Inamzhon Usmankhodzhayev of the duties of first secretary of the party Central Committee and member of the Central Committee Buro in connection with retirement for health reasons.

Rafik Nishanov, president of the Presidium of Uzbekistan's Supreme Soviet, was elected first secretary of the Central Committee.

Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Georgiy Razumovskiy addressed the plenum.

Economic

Slyunkov, Others Address Training Session
LD121558 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1410 GMT 12 Jan 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] An economic training session for secretaries of party gorkoms of republican, kray, and oblast centers and other major towns and heads of economic departments of Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union Republics, and party kraykoms and obkoms, as well as of first secretaries of Moscow party raykoms has ended at the Institute for Raising the Qualifications of Leading Party, Local Soviet, and Ideological Cadres at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

Theoretical and practical questions of the radical restructuring of the management of the country's economy in light of the CPSU Central Committee June 1987 Plenum's decisions were examined.

There was a broad exchange of opinions on forms and methods of work by party committees in conditions of radical restructuring of the management of the economy, developing democracy, and self-government by labor collectives.

A report and closing address on the results of the study session were delivered by Comrade Slyunkov. The students were addressed by Comrades Zaykov and Dolgikh and by heads of ministries and departments.

Price System 'Barrier to Development'
LD131230 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1207 GMT 13 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow, 13 Dec (TASS)—The carrying out of economic reform in the USSR is closely tied to improving the mechanism of price formation. Anatoliy Komin, USSR State Committee for Prices first deputy chairman, writes about the reasons such measures have long been overdue in the economy in the paper titled Scientific and Technical Revolution: Problems and Solutions.

It is his view the existing system of prices in the USSR has, over the past few years, become a barrier toward economic development. The thesis that under socialism prices ought to decline in keeping with production costs decreasing and with labor productivity increasing has turned out to be erroneous. On the contrary, the potential of prices increasing has been growing in the price formation system over the past 30 years.

Various methods of solving the problem are currently under examination in the USSR. Budget research is being carried out with this aim in mind; the necessary date is being gathered and analyzed, Anatoliy Komin said. When specific proposals on retail prices have been compiled, they will be published for the purpose of a nationwide discussion. No price rises either on industrial goods or for foodstuffs will take place without it. Glasnost in the reform of prices, Anatoliy Komin opines, will help avoid mistakes and exaggerations and will help to take the interests of the majority into account.

Scientific

Summit's 'Fresh Impulse' Brings Cooperation
LD121142 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—More than 40 joint projects in 11 major areas of environmental protection are being drawn up now by Soviet and American experts, a TASS correspondent was told by Yuriy Kazakov, executive secretary of the joint Soviet-American commission in the field of environmental protection.

Soviet-American cooperation in that field develops both in the form of joint development of technology and equipment and also through the holding of expeditions and laboratory research with the participation of experts of both countries.

Last year alone, Yuriy Kazakov said, energy plants for the scrubbing of effluent gases of ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy plants were jointly developed, several joint cruises were made in Soviet and American ships to study the ecological situation of the seas, including of the area of the Barents Sea. A Soviet-American experiment was held in the aerological chain in the town of Rylsk to study the chemical composition of the atmosphere and measure the aerosol levels in it. Work is now being

completed to develop modern equipment for water protection and methods are being drawn up to prevent the pollution of seas with oil. The trials of the Soviet oil slick collector Svetlomor designed to clean the seas from pollution with oil has been successfully held in the USA. Experts of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control are preparing a project of creating a cordinated Soviet-American mutual assistance service for distress situations on high seas.

This year it is also planned to carry out joint research of the ozone layer of the atmosphere in the Antarctic. This work is to be done in the Soviet stations with the use of 100 ozone probes supplied from the USA. The experiments for the study of the composition of the atmosphere will be carried out by Soviet and American meteorologists in Arctic areas too.

Joint Soviet-American projects, Yuriy Kazakov noted, ensure specific results and help towards resolving ecological problems. After the Soviet-American summit meeting a fresh impulse was given to developing cooperation in the field of environmental protection. On the basis of the accords reached in Washington the scheduled session of the mixed Soviet-American commission due to be held in Moscow in February this year is to outline specific measures for further deepening cooperation in ecology.

Moscow Outlines Tasks of Cosmos-1906 Satellite

LD101352 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 10 Jan 88

[Text] In Moscow, information has been released about what the new Soviet satellite Cosmos-1906 will be doing. It was launched on the eve of 1988 for remote control probing of the surface of the earth. Pictures it takes from space show the condition of the farmland and forests, the pollution of the seas and rivers, and also how man's activity affects the environment. Such remote control probing from space makes it easier to look for natural resources on the ground and the sea and ocean shelves. The economic effect of such exploration runs into hundreds of millions of rubles.

Returned Cosmonauts Interviewed on Readjustment

LD091706 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The post-flight medical examination of Yuriy Romanenko, Aleksandr Aleksandrov, and Anatoliy Levchenko is being completed at the Baykonur cosmodrome.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] The morning run. Many people know what it feels like, but for these three it is like returning from the tempo of space to the tempo of earth. Yet the distance is just 300 metres. Make allowances for the time: it is a week ago now since fairly intensive exercising began, an unprecedented fact, if you take into account the period spent in weightlessness.

It is your 10th day on earth today. What has changed in the way you feel on earth, let's put it like that, purely emotionally and purely physically?

[Romanenko] My perception of earth's natural gravity has probably changed. While at the start I really felt the whole weight of my body after returning from space—there were some sensations of pain in my shins and back muscles—now the earth's pull is decreasing, it is becoming usual, affectionate, and we are tolerating it easily.

[Correspondent] And the flight engineer?

[Aleksandrov] I would like to say, well, some, well, let's sum up some medical indicators. That one's condition is, as it were, being programmed by the body. That is, you already know what awaits you tomorrow and in several days, and the body, as it were, running ahead of this process of recollection feels considerably better at first, in the very first minutes after landing that it did, for example, in comparison with previous flights by Yuriy and me, and builds up, as it were, its ability to combat gravity. Every day.

[Levchenko] Of course, it was easier for me because in 9 days the body had not yet fully adapted. I did two flights at once.

[Correspondent] Two flights at once, yes.

[Levchenko] Two flights and the landing, and then, when I had flown here, it was all back in place, as if I had not flown, like a fairy tale, like a dream.

[I.M. Reznikov, crew's doctor] They are striving to extend their physical loads so as to get to work more quickly. I am sure that they will make good progress here, too, I feel, but our task now is not to overdo it.

[Correspondent] Today we filmed Yuriy Romanenko, Aleksandr Aleksandrov, and Anatoliy Levchenko only in the streets. They were simply going for walks, and talking and, of course, remembering, at times even a little sadly. And then, back to work. The muscular system and the cosmonauts' other organs are, in the doctors' estimation, in good condition, but as yet they are far from terrestrial perfection.

[I.K. Tarasov, medical training director] Well, we can sum up some results even now about the condition of the crew. You saw the crew after the first few hours when we brought them here to the Cosmonaut Hotel, and today. When the cosmonauts came back to us here from space we had to teach them to walk. That is, so that this system could again function just as it did before. You might say, why was this necessary? Yes, a person can in principle

restore himself slowly and gradually by himself. But the fact of the matter is that a cosmonaut is a professional and this professional has to get back to work.

[Correspondent] And the cosmonaut [words indistinct].

[Tarasov] It is his job. The prophylactic system itself is somewhat different, the technology for the construction of these prophylactic facilities is different and, basically, in this case, one must note here the high standard of work by the crew. This standard manifested itself not only in carrying out all the elements (?of punctuality) of the flight program itself but specifically in their utilization of the prophylactic facilities. [end recording]

Cardiologist on Cosmonauts

LD121121 Moscow TASS in English 0659 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—Soviet cosmonaut Yuriy Romanenko, who completed his record 326 day space marathon, feels by far better than one could expect after such a long stay of the crew commander of the complex "Mir" in orbit, a TASS correspondent was told by cardiologist Nurmuhammed Muharlyamov, head of the clinical department of the All-Union Cardiology Centre.

"My colleagues-cardiologists, in common with other physicians, are satisfied with the state of health of both Yuriy Romanenko and Aleksandr Aleksandrov, who spent 160 days in orbit," Nurmuhammed Muharlyamov said.

He noted that a careful medical check on the health of the cosmonauts was ensured throughout the whole of the mission. All information which came from the orbit as well as the information obtained in the period of readaptation after the flight is of much interest for science, since no earthman has ever spent so much time in conditions of weightlessness as Yuriy Romanenko. Every endurance flight, the scientist stressed, provides fresh information for in-depth investigations in the field of space biology and medicine.

Space Medicine 'Success'

LD122216 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 12 TASS—TASS scientific analyst Nikolay Zheleznov writes:

Today Yuriy Romanenko, the holder of the world achievement in the orbital mission duration, returned from the Baykonur Cosmodrome to the Chkalovskiy airfield near Moscow. A two-week period of readaptation after the prolonged mission (the flight ended on December 28) can be regarded as nearly complete for Romanenko.

Academician Oleg Gazenko, director of the Medico-Biological Problems Institute of the USSR Ministry of Public Health, regards as a great success of space medicine the very fact of lifting the stiff guardianship of medics with respect to the cosmonaut who had worked in a state of weightlessness for nearly a year. But not only of medicine. [phrase as received] Designers of the Mir station can rightfully consider this victory as their own as well. It would have been impossible to increase regularly the time of missions without spacious premises enabling cosmonauts to move freely inside their space home and to do active sport exercises on trainers, said Gazenko. Yuriy Romanenko walked on his own three hours after the touch-down and did not permit accompanying doctors to help him.

"Nevertheless," pointed out Oleg Gazenko, "We should be reasonable and careful in advancing ahead and in increasing the duration of space missions. I believe that if the crew of Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov which relieved Romanenko, work on orbit for a year, this can be regarded a reasonable limit for today."

And still, where is the limit of a price to be paid for confidence that man will be permitted to set out for a three-year mission to Mars? Oleg Gazenko believes that for this purpose there is no need for testing cosmonauts on a near-earth orbit for three years. Today we have quite enough information to simulate a Mars mission from the medical point of view in a more economical way. Besides, our space programme is not based on Mars alone. No matter how it is packed with astrophysics, space technology and geophysics, Oleg Gazenko said. The programme, in its essence, is both technical and humanitarian. The fundamental science on man cannot develop without objective data on permissible limits of vital functions in space.

TV Broadcasts Titov, Manarov 'Mir' Activities

LD072216 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Jan 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The following is the first report on the "Okeany" [callsign of Titov and Manarov] cosmonauts from their orbiting station. Here is a report from space.

[Manarov] About a week has passed since the "Taymyry" [callsign of Romanenko and Aleksandrov] cosmonauts left the station, and we have set about carrying out an extensive number of scientific and technical experiments. Today, for instance, we will carry out an experiment on the Korund installation to obtain new materials. In addition, today we will be performing as experiment on the galvanic deposition of materials with the assistance of the (Eri) installation. This undertaking will serve the purpose of making various minor repairs

aboard the orbiting station. Another instrument we have switched on today is the Mariya appliance, which measures the streams of charged particles near our orbiting station.

[Titov] In general, it is the first time that there has been a complete change of crew. Some of the operations we have inherited from the "Taymyry" cosmonauts and that have been well explained to us are being carried out by us without [words indistinct]. This is planned by the Flight Control Center. However, we are spending more time on some of the operations that had not been worked through previously by the former crew.

[Manarov] We believe this first experience is very successful and can be used for further expeditions aboard our orbiting station.

Cosmonauts 'Completely Adapted'

LD111157 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 11 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 11 TASS—Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have ended their third week aboard the orbital complex Mir.

In the past few days the crew has undergone a thorough medical check-up. Its results showed that both cosmonauts felt well and had completely adapted to the flight conditions. The pulse rates of the commander and the flight engineer were 66 and 70 beats per minute respectively and their arterial pressure was 115/75 and 110/70 millimetres of the mercury column.

Today the cosmonauts are engaged in maintenance work on the on-board systems of the complex, and rig up the scientific equipment. Time was also set aside for physical exercises.

The programme for tomorrow includes experiments on space materials studies and astrophysical observations. With the help of the ultraviolet telescope "Glazar," pictures will be taken of separate sections of the celestial sphere in the Orion and Eridanus constellations.

According to reports of the cosmonauts and telemetric information, the flight of the manned complex Mir is passing normally.

'Mir' To Receive Nodules

LD111023 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 11 Jan 88

[Text] The Soviet cosmonauts on board the orbital complex Mir are in their 4th week of flight. Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have adapted themselves well to working in conditions of weightlessness. Specialists point out there is excellent team work on the part of the crew conducting research at the request of hundreds of scientific and national economic organizations of the Soviet Union. That includes experiments in biology, medicine, space technology, and astrophysics.

A Radio Moscow reporter was told at the flight control center that four more research modules are being prepared to be launched to the Mir complex. In the next few years the complex will have a special air lock system through which the cosmonauts could go on space walks and also have a mini factory for smelting semiconductors, an observatory with optical telescopes, and a nature study module.

TASS Notes Antarctic Research Station's Focus

LD121734 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0533 GMT 12 Jan 88

[Excerpts] Queen Mary Land, Bunger Oasis, 12 Jan (TASS)—TASS special correspondent Nikolay Konstantinov reports:

Locks aren't the usual thing in Antarctica. Gennadiy Kadachigov, hydrologist and aqualungist of the 33d Soviet Antarctic Expedition, stretched out his hand and opened a door that had been closed 10 months ago. [passage omitted]

Now the accent in research work in this region is being shifted to the hydrology and biology of the Bunger Oasis. With the help of aqualungs and underwater apparatus, it is intended to discover details which are very interesting for science concerning the interaction between the freshwater lakes of the oasis and the waters of the sea with which they are joined beneath the ice shelf; and also the conditions and special features of the biocenoses of this kind of "dual" environment. Simultaneously the biologists will make a selection of background areas for observations under the biological monitoring program.

Now two onboard helicopters from the scientific expedition ship "Academik Fedorov" have started delivering cargo to the oasis. The task is to provide the 12 polar workers with everything necessary for 3 months of living and working and to bring in building materials for extending the station.

Personnel Changeover at Station

LD101705 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 10 Jan 88

[Text] Moscow January 10 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from Mirniy (Antarctica).

A change-over of polar researchers has been effected in the Soviet observatory Mirniy on the Antarctic coasts. The researchers and specialists who conducted observations of south polar environment for a year boarded the research vessel "Professor Vize" which took course towards Buenos Aires. From there, the polar researchers will be brought home by an AEROFLOT plane at the end of January.

The scientific expeditionary ship "Akademik Fedorov" has wound up unloading operations at the roadstead of Mirniy and weighed anchor. In accordance with the schedule of the 33rd Soviet Antarctic expedition, the flagship of its research flotilla will circumnavigate the ice continent.

After the two vessels left the station, the new staff of the observatory set about their everyday work. Antarctic mid-summer is the most strenuous time. A snow-train will leave Mirniy soon for Ice Cap "C". The train is to cover fifteen hundred kilometres across the snow desert.

Another party will go to ice research ground at the 150 km mark for drilling. A train with cargoes for the inland station Vostok located at the 'Pole of Cold' will set out not later than the end of January.

'Powerful' TV Station Constructed in Izhevsk

PM071123 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Nonstaff correspondent A. Artamonov report: "Distances Reduced"]

[Text] Izhevsk, 29 Dec—During the first days of the new year the inhabitants of remote regions of Udmurtia will receive for the first time the second all-union and local television programs.

The state commission has accepted a powerful radio and television transmitting station constructed in Izhevsk. The mast is 345 meters high. The equipment is the latest. Such apparatus has so far been set up only in Riga and Izhevsk. Muscovites installed the equipment. A measuring complex was sent from Czechoslovakia.

The commissioning of the new station makes it possible to broadcast to almost 94% of the autonomous republic's inhabitants.